

INDIANA

Lyle J. Fowler, Bloomington, Ind., in place of G. W. Purcell, deceased.
James K. Stanforth, Jeffersonville, Ind., in place of H. T. Ferguson, retired.
Dewayne Hamilton, Morgantown, Ind., in place of O. R. Wells, retired.
Clyde M. Matthews, North Vernon, Ind., in place of J. W. Clerkin, resigned.

IOWA

James M. Pomeroy, Dedham, Iowa, in place of W. H. Meshek, transferred.
Orle L. Jones, Earlham, Iowa, in place of O. J. DeVault, retired.
Clair L. Bowers, Runnells, Iowa, in place of William Bowers, transferred.
Burtis M. Bush, Stacyville, Iowa, in place of J. C. Kinney, retired.

KANSAS

James S. McCormick, Burr Oak, Kans., in place of R. W. Smullins, transferred.
Frederick H. Boyd, Fowler, Kans., in place of M. V. Bohling, transferred.
Wesley V. Joy, Narka, Kans., in place of R. L. Bever, deceased.
Ivan D. Holland, Olathe, Kans., in place of E. R. Marshall, resigned.
Edward J. Spineto, Pittsburg, Kans., in place of R. E. Mangrum, retired.

KENTUCKY

William W. Peavyhouse, Mount Sterling, Ky., in place of G. B. Senff, retired.

MARYLAND

Elwood M. Walls, East New Market, Md., in place of E. R. Twilley, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Everett G. Reed, Bryantville, Mass., in place of H. A. Grant, retired.
Donald M. Stacey, Marblehead, Mass., in place of T. D. Cudihy, retired.
Joseph E. Yelle, Norton, Mass., in place of T. W. Curran, deceased.
Robert H. Hughes, Oak Bluffs, Mass., in place of A. E. Holmes, removed.
Edgard A. Whitcomb II, West Boylston, Mass., in place of R. L. Soule, retired.

MICHIGAN

William A. Munroe, Saginaw, Mich., in place of L. S. Jennings, deceased.
Gerald Howard, Stevensville, Mich., in place of F. C. Miller, retired.

MINNESOTA

Arle R. Wilder, Amboy, Minn., in place of H. E. Otterstein, removed.
Raymond J. Michelau, Dundee, Minn., in place of G. E. Arens, resigned.

MISSOURI

Roy E. Gregg, Creighton, Mo., in place of R. L. O'Neal, deceased.
Marion L. McBride, Eureka, Mo., in place of L. G. Kidd, transferred.
John W. Jones, Lebanon, Mo., in place of J. H. Easley, retired.
Wilber M. Williams, Lucerne, Mo., in place of O. T. Hughs, transferred.

MONTANA

Willard J. Adams, Bridger, Mont., in place of H. H. Harrison, retired.
Gordon G. Garrick, Outlook, Mont., in place of L. K. C. Roderick, deceased.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

James Martin Fortier, Center Conway, N. H., in place of L. T. Garland, removed.

NEW JERSEY

John R. Dougherty, Bordentown, N. J., in place of M. L. Dunn, resigned.
Irving Krieger, East Orange, N. J., in place of P. L. Fellingner, retired.
Margaret G. Spencer, Lake Hopatcong, N. J., in place of E. M. Crater, retired.
Allan B. Nixon, Moorestown, N. J., in place of G. M. Gibson, deceased.
Clifford C. Cooper, Navesink, N. J., in place of W. T. Keeshan, deceased.

Frank Ella, Union City, N. J., in place of Arthur Necker, resigned.
George Ekholm, Whitehouse, N. J., in place of G. B. Seals, removed.

NEW YORK

Henry S. Salfi, Accord, N. Y., in place of G. L. Miller, deceased.
James R. Walker, Baldwinville, N. Y., in place of W. H. O'Brien, Jr., removed.
Donald L. Phelps, Burdett, N. Y., in place of C. T. Burnett, transferred.
Paul E. Lunt, Fort Ann, N. Y., in place of A. L. Lyon, retired.
Walter M. Lowerre, Haines Falls, N. Y., in place of H. J. Myer, retired.
Donald R. Harvison, Olean, N. Y., in place of J. J. Shortell, deceased.
Francis X. Hannigan, Ossining, N. Y., in place of T. A. Kenney, deceased.
Henry E. Holley, Otisville, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Zimmerman, deceased.
Alvin R. Bunce, Pavillion, N. Y., in place of T. Q. Quinlan, retired.
Henry A. Glasstetter, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in place of C. I. Lavery, retired.
Jack L. Edleson, Tarrytown, N. Y., in place of J. M. Kelly, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

Daniel F. Sawyer, Jr., Blounts Creek, N. C., in place of B. L. Adams, resigned.
Robert Duke Tutterow, Mocksville, N. C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.
William B. Johnson, Salemburg, N. C., in place of L. L. White, retired.

OHIO

Percy H. Friend, Baltic, Ohio, in place of A. P. Hahn, retired.
Gaylord W. Shutt, Convoy, Ohio, in place of O. W. Gray, retired.
Ernest Falb, Copley, Ohio, in place of Ivah Averhill, retired.
Talmage O. Nelson, Crestline, Ohio, in place of F. P. Hayes, retired.
Walter E. Sindel, Delta, Ohio, in place of W. F. White, transferred.
Paul H. Marshall, Marshallville, Ohio, in place of H. D. Zeigler, transferred.
Girden B. Harrington, Peninsula, Ohio, in place of W. P. Bean, removed.
Clair E. Olson, Stow, Ohio, in place of F. G. Wetmore, retired.

OREGON

Conrad Burbank, North Portland, Oreg., in place of H. C. Knapp, retired.
Richard V. Carleson, Rickreall, Oreg., in place of E. B. Rowell, resigned.
John R. Metzger, Sandy, Oreg., in place of R. I. Loundree, deceased.

PENNSYLVANIA

Gerald E. Rishel, Boalsburg, Pa., in place of E. A. Murray, retired.
Bernard J. Arnold, Brockport, Pa., in place of Agatha Mullany, retired.
Charles M. Brubaker, Dornsife, Pa., in place of L. E. Latshaw, retired.
Anna E. Lefever, Holtwood, Pa., in place of B. D. Kilburn, retired.
Fred J. Mills, Houtzdale, Pa., in place of J. J. McGrath, resigned.
Dallas L. Darr, Jacobus, Pa., in place of G. I. Zartman, resigned.
George A. McDowell, Jamestown, Pa., in place of B. W. Webb, retired.
Michael B. Krell, Lansford, Pa., in place of W. J. Cannon, deceased.
Marianna W. McClelland, Masontown, Pa., in place of H. G. Provins, retired.
Godfrey G. Drake, Milford, Pa., in place of A. E. Hinkel, transferred.
Russell S. Weiss, Milford Square, Pa., in place of R. C. Weikert, removed.
Doyle H. Brewer, Orangeville, Pa., in place of O. V. Deterick, deceased.
Allen W. Reep, Petrolia, Pa., in place of J. R. Roach, retired.
Lillian M. Mengle, Port Clinton, Pa., in place of N. H. Hafer, resigned.

Harold D. Schildt, Reading, Pa., in place of W. A. Ringer, deceased.
Twila K. Scott, Seneca, Pa., in place of Z. L. Smith, resigned.

Jacob F. Lefever, Smoketown, Pa., in place of G. V. Kingree, Jr., resigned.
Frederick E. Zimmerman, Southampton, Pa., in place of F. M. Severns, retired.
Walter C. Snyder, Swarthmore, Pa., in place of A. P. Smalley, retired.
Charles W. Snyder, Three Springs, Pa., in place of J. C. Hess, resigned.
Charlotte M. Chase, West Springfield, Pa., in place of M. R. Fowler, resigned.
Keith G. Baird, Youngwood, Pa., in place of L. H. Zeilinger, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Harold O. Ewing, Jr., Turton, S. Dak., in place of V. O. Klapperich, declined.
Marvin W. Wilcox, Volin, S. Dak., in place of B. M. Christenson, transferred.
Clair E. Woodard, White, S. Dak., in place of R. R. Davis, removed.

TENNESSEE

Samuel Shelton Crass, Jr., Oliver Springs, Tenn., in place of J. McD. Ernest, deceased.

TEXAS

Elmer C. Boatler, Big Spring, Tex., in place of Nat Shick, retired.
D. W. Springer, Blooming Grove, Tex., in place of J. R. Griffin, deceased.
Allen A. Keese, Medina, Tex., in place of E. J. Banta, retired.
Joe P. Spalding, Sadler, Tex., in place of E. G. Perry, deceased.
Harry Reast, Whitesboro, Tex., in place of G. W. Hodges, transferred.

UTAH

James Austin Cope, Jr., Spanish Fork, Utah, in place of H. M. Creer, transferred.

VERMONT

William P. Cook, Underhill, Vt., in place of L. F. Lamphere, transferred.
Charles A. O'Brien, White River Junction, Vt., in place of D. P. Healy, retired.
Leon E. Andrus, Wolcott, Vt., in place of O. B. Lafont, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Carroll E. Conner, Elkhorn, Wis., in place of T. B. Morrissy, retired.
Benjamin C. Hoffman, Helenville, Wis., in place of G. W. Rickeman, deceased.
Archie L. Kirby, Humbird, Wis., in place of John Michael, retired.
Mac Marshall, Jr., La Farge, Wis., in place of H. M. Norris, deceased.
Frank W. Ocain, Redgranite, Wis., in place of W. W. Lawrie, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 15, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
Dr. Clyde V. Hickerson, minister, Barton Heights Baptist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, we thank Thee that Thou art the light that never fails, the love that never forgets, and the life that never ends.

We praise Thee for the many manifestations of Thy concern for us as individuals and as a nation. We would be very grateful to Thee for the privilege of being citizens of this land and for the heritage of so many and so great benefits bought at so dear a price by others. May our gratitude be so deep and so sincere that we shall always seek our country's highest welfare above our own personal advancement and partisan interests.

Grant, we beseech Thee, wisdom and guidance to these men and women who stand today in places of high responsibility and public trust—that they have understanding of our deepest needs and to know what we as a nation ought to do. Help us, we pray, to believe that righteousness exalteth a nation and that our true wealth and security rest ultimately not upon the material but upon the moral strength and the spiritual vision of all our people.

Help us this day to do justly, to love kindness and to walk humbly with our God.

In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 11, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; and

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5337) entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a United States Air Force Academy, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. BYRD to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 54-9.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMENDMENT OF KOREAN GI BILL

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Korean GI bill, Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which would permit an eligible veteran to initiate his course of training by October 15, 1954, or 2 years after his discharge or release from active service, whichever is the later.

Under the law at the present time the last day on which an eligible veteran can initiate his course is August 20, 1954. This means that veterans who have not yet initiated their course of training and who were discharged on or before August 20, 1952, would not be able to enroll in any school or institution of higher learning because most schools would not be open in August.

My bill simply seeks to correct this situation by permitting the veteran to have until October 15, this year, to begin his training, since by that time all of the schools will have opened their doors for the fall semester.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Training and Education of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I am hoping the full committee will report this bill out as soon as possible. I believe that all will agree it is a meritorious measure and should be enacted at the earliest moment.

HUNGARIAN FREEDOM DAY

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, before making any remarks, I would like to say that I know my close friend, our stricken colleague, ALVIN BENTLEY, of Michigan, had planned to speak on this subject today. Having worked in Hungary, he had firsthand experience with its people, and knew well its desire for independence. As many of us here today know, the 15th of March marks a traditional day of celebration for all Hungarians, wherever they may be. On that date in 1848 Hungarian patriots first expressed publicly their determination to win independence. Since that time March 15 has become for Hungarians what the Fourth of July is for us—Independence Day.

Since 1848 the American people have followed with sympathy the Hungarians' fight for independence. They watched with sorrow the subjection of Hungary

to foreign tyranny. Today they share the aspirations of all Hungarians for eventual liberation. It is fitting that we should use this occasion as an opportunity to send a message of hope to those now suffering under Soviet tyranny. We admire the bravery and courage of those who are keeping alive their faith in freedom and democracy. We wish these people to know that America will never cease her efforts to win freedom and independence for all peoples.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House today for 30 minutes, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to address the House for 20 minutes on tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any other special orders heretofore entered.

IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

FINGERPRINTING BRITONS

A great deal of ire was expressed in Parliament the other day over a requirement of the McCarran-Walter Act that British applicants for visas to the United States be fingerprinted. There were indignant demands for retaliation in kind—opposed by the Foreign Undersecretary on the ground that two wrongs would not make a right. The furor, lacking as it may be in logic, is by no means difficult to understand psychologically.

There is nothing degrading about being fingerprinted. Of itself, it seems no worse than being photographed—a normal form of identification required of Britons, no doubt, as well as of Americans, in numerous situations. Fingerprints are the surest way yet devised of identifying an individual; they are an effective precaution against imposture and as such a protection for honest men.

What irks Englishmen, we suspect, is not fingerprinting of itself but fingerprinting as a symbol of the ugly excesses of the McCarran-Walter Act and of the American preoccupation with internal security. The resentment over this triviality reflects, doubtless, the culmination of a long concern over practices which make this country seem sometimes a mirror image of the totalitarianism against which it is defending itself. We cannot help wondering if the McCarran-Walter Act gives the United States anything like as much in terms of security as it cost the country in terms of foreign respect and regard.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday there appeared the above editorial in the Washington Post—an editorial which was critical of the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to fingerprinting. The editorial expresses the indignation of Members of the British Parliament over a provision of the law which, incidentally, has been the law since 1940.

I am not greatly concerned about the feelings of Members of the British Parliament toward steps that we take in protecting ourselves, but I am disturbed because of the number of American newspapers which are now engaged in a deliberate attempt to mislead the American people with respect to the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. MOULDER] may be granted official leave of absence for 2 days on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SUPPORT PRICE ON COTTONSEED

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Agriculture was before the House Committee on Agriculture last week. He made several rather amazing statements. One in reply to an inquiry of mine about the amount of damage that had been done to farmers because of his action in reducing the support price on cottonseed from 90 percent to 75 percent last year when the price paid to farmers went to the lower level. He disclaimed any knowledge that there had been any protests filed. It seems that either someone is keeping the facts from Mr. Benson or that he is unfamiliar with what is going on in the Department of Agriculture. I know there were numerous protests filed, both before this action was taken and after it was taken.

I was further amazed to find that instead of acknowledging this protest he said he had received commendation from certain industries. It may be that he had received commendation from some manufacturers who took advantage of this great loss to the farmers, because while the support price was reduced causing the price received by the farmer to fall, the price of shortening and the price of salad oils and other manufactured products actually went up.

Now Mr. Speaker, just to refresh our memories, including that of the Secretary, as to what happened last year let us review the record.

First of all, Secretary Benson junked the package plan which worked so well from 1950 through 1952. Now the program is set up to make direct loans to farmers themselves, which, of course, is not practical anywhere in the Cotton Belt except in the arid regions of the Far West. In other words, it is downright ridiculous to even suggest that a farmer store cottonseed on the farm—it just cannot be done.

I have copies of letters in my files addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture, carbon copies of which are mailed to Howard Gordon, at that time Administrator of the PMA, who, incidentally,

acknowledged the letters of protest relative to both the junking of the package support program and the proposed reduction in support price.

In addition to copies of protests filed by Missouri producers I also have a copy of a telegram from the Agricultural Council of Arkansas to Secretary Benson wherein they expressed their protest in these words:

This farmer organization, many of whose members are ginners and have interest in cooperative oil mills, urge you support cottonseed at 90 percent of parity and continue the present program of purchasing cottonseed products in one package. Past experience has proven on-the-farm storage impractical and unworkable in this area.

I also feel that someone of Secretary Benson's staff should call his attention to a telegram under date of June 15, 1953, which reads as follows:

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

Your announced intention to reduce cottonseed price support breaks faith with cotton producer and repudiates President Eisenhower's campaign pledge. Also inconsistent with better program. Fear trade organizations have undermined farmers' interest.

W. P. HUNTER,
President, Missouri Cotton Producers
Association, Portageville, Mo.

During the month of July 1953 there was an interchange of correspondence between Mr. Hilton L. Bracey, executive vice president of the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, and Mr. M. B. Braswell, Acting Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration, which further substantiates the basis of my inquiry to the Secretary last week. Furthermore, I feel certain that Missouri and Arkansas cotton producers were not the only ones who were protesting this unfair discriminatory action of the Secretary of Agriculture, and while, of course, the Secretary should not be held responsible for everything that occurs in the Department of Agriculture, it would seem that one of the several members of his staff by whom he was surrounded during the time that he was testifying before our committee would have reminded the Secretary that numerous protests had been filed and that the Department had every opportunity to know of the great injury which was being inflicted upon the cotton producers of the Nation, causing them losses of many millions of dollars but with no benefit to the consuming public.

ESTABLISH GOVERNMENT MONOPOLY ON LIQUOR IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, there is great need in the District of Columbia for additional revenue. I am today introducing a bill to create a whisky mo-

nopoly in the District of Columbia and give to the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board the exclusive right to operate retail liquor stores.

Last year there were 16 monopoly States in America. In 1952 the profit in those 16 States from the sale of liquor was over \$200,000. It is estimated by the Library of Congress that last year the sale of liquor in the District amounted to \$75 million. If that be true, a conservative estimate of the profit to be derived from operating retail liquor stores is between \$15 and \$20 million. In my humble opinion, it is far better to raise money this way rather than by putting a tax on groceries.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today and on Wednesday next after the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes each on the double taxation theory of the tax bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CHANGE NAME OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think every Member of Congress today is quite concerned about procedures in Government. I offer as a suggestion for possible adoption by the House a change in the name of the Committee on Un-American Activities to Committee on Activities Against the United States.

We are a legal body. The word "American" is a cultural, geographic, continental concept. We get it from Amerigo Vespucci—1452-1512—an expert in calculations on latitude and longitude, a skilled map draftsman.

Many things make up the word "American," but there is one concept, a legal concept, that makes up the United States, and that is "Equal Justice Under Law."

I respectfully suggest to the Congress that it consider seriously using the title "Activities against the United States," instead of "Un-American Activities."

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we were assured by the administration that come this March prosperity would be on its way back. We have been

patient as we were once before when we were told prosperity was just around the corner. But now, Mr. Speaker, the Ides of March have come. It is time to look around that we may know how fares it with our beloved country. In Chicago, Alvin E. Rose, the city's welfare commissioner, has just told an unemployment conference that he will be compelled to call upon the Governor of Illinois to summon the State legislature into emergency session if the relief load continues to grow. Representatives of 250,000 Chicago workers passed resolutions urging a moratorium on installment payments and other debts for persons unemployed through no fault of their own.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

AMERICA FIRSTERS, OR THE ISOLATIONISTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the friends of the U. N. and the one-world government advocates will take notice of what the Vice President told us Saturday night.

Time was, not so long ago, when Gen. Robert E. Wood, head of that organization of patriotic Americans who were then insisting that a President and the Congress were in duty bound, in considering not only a domestic but a foreign policy, to give first consideration to the welfare of our people and the security of our Republic.

The officers of that organization, its members, and all who agreed with them were abused and vilified by certain internationalists and advocates of a one-world organization.

Not only were those who then thought, and who then were insisting, that the duty of a citizen and of a legislator was to first serve the interest of his country, charged with lacking in charity, in kindness, in consideration for other people, and other nations, but it seemed impossible for the one-worlders to find language abusive enough to, in their opinion, properly describe those who advocated a free and independent Republic.

Benjamin Franklin once said that experience was a dear school, but that fools would learn at no other. Certainly those who opposed the America Firsters were not fools. Assuredly they were not dumb. In the main, they were exceptionally well educated, at least in the higher branches of learning.

Some were extremely wealthy, many possessed exceptionally great political power, and some held high positions in the Government. They assumed to

speak for all, and questioning their judgment, the conclusions which they appeared to entertain, in the opinion of at least many editors and columnists, was heresy.

But from bitter experience a lesson has apparently been learned.

Billions of dollars have been spent, hundreds of thousands—yes; a million or more men have been wounded or killed in the well-concealed effort to force us into some form of a world organization where our independence would be lost, the welfare and freedom of our people destroyed.

It has been said, "All things come round to him who will but wait."

To some of us, the Saturday night talk of our Vice President was an assertion of the unsoundness of not only the domestic but of the foreign policy of the last two administrations.

After consultation with the President, and evidently with his approval, the Vice President, among other things, told us that our previous foreign policy of falling into the trap of becoming involved in every dispute anywhere in the world a dispute might arise, even to the extent of sending our men to fight thousands of miles from home, was not only unsound but inevitably would, if continued, ruin us.

That is no more, that is no less, than the doctrine for which the America Firsters contended, for which they were misused and abused, yes; and some of them hauled into court by persecuting officials of a previous administration.

But listen again to the words of our Vice President, as he gave us the President's and his own outline of our future foreign policy:

And in determining what that policy should be we decided to find what the men in the Kremlin were up to. We found that militarily their plan apparently was to destroy us by drawing us into little wars all over the world with their satellites, however, where they themselves were not involved, and where due to our inability to bring to bear our great superiority on the sea, in the air, that we were unable to win those wars.

We found that economically, their plan apparently was to force the United States to stay armed to the teeth to be prepared to fight anywhere, anywhere in the world that they, the men in the Kremlin, chose.

Why, because they knew that this would force us into bankruptcy, that we would destroy our freedom in an attempt to defend it.

REFUSE TO BE TRAPPED

Well, we decided that we would not fall into these traps, and so we adopted a new principle, and that new principle summed up is this:

Rather than let the Communists nibble us to death all over the world in little wars, we would rely in the future primarily on our massive mobile retaliatory power which we could use in our discretion against the major source of aggression at times and places that we chose.

We adjusted our armed strength to meet the requirements of this new concept, and what was just as important, we let the world and we let the Communists know what we intended to do.

If that statement means anything at all, boiled down to one sentence, it means this: That we will not be trapped into disputes or wars wherever over the world they may occur, unless we are ourselves

vitaly interested; that, if an aggressor attacks us, we will hit him with all our power where it will hurt him the most.

The thought thus expressed is what the America Firsters intended to say, what they said, and it was the course of action they advocated. The policy outlined Saturday night by the Vice President was the policy long ago announced by the America Firsters; it was the policy that was given support by General MacArthur, when he told us in substance that it was useless to engage in war unless the purpose was to win.

It was apparently the thought behind the statement of Herbert Hoover when he advised that we could not with safety fight everywhere in the world that the Kremlin might induce a satellite to aggravate us. That, as everyone knew, we should confine our line of national defense to an area which we could supply and maintain.

So permit me to say to the One Worlders and to the advocates of U. N. that it is time that even they begin to think of the welfare of our people, of the security of our Republic; of a foreign policy which will enable us to care for and protect our own, rather than of a policy impossible of implementation; a policy which if followed will ultimately destroy us.

It is time that this administration, knowing as it does that no other first-class power conscripts its men to fight in foreign lands, quit drafting the youth of America in an effort to settle disputes of other nations.

The warmongers, the profiteers, the seekers after war profits, or "fool's gold," as Franklin Delano Roosevelt called it, should be given notice by the people of our country that no longer will they furnish cannon fodder in an effort to establish a one-world government.

FRANCOISE BRESNAHAN

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 752) for the relief of Francoise Bresnahan, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 7, after "fee," insert "The Attorney General is hereby directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation and warrant of deportation in the case of said Francoise Bresnahan, and is further directed hereafter not to exclude or deport her from the United States by reason of any of the facts constituting ground for deportation as set forth in such outstanding order or warrant of deportation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEROSLAV, BOZENA, YVONKA, AND JARKA ONDRICEK

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Jeroslav, Bozena, Yvonka, and Jarka Ondricek with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 11, strike out "four" and insert "the required numbers."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PAY CERTAIN DISABILITY COMPENSATION PAYMENTS QUARTERLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 631) to provide that compensation of veterans for service-connected disability, rated 20 percent or less disabling, shall be paid quarterly rather than monthly.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL FUNDS TO COMPLETE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3986) to authorize the appropriation of additional funds to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

OPERATION OF HEALTH FACILITIES FOR INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 303) to transfer the administration of health services for Indians and the operation of Indian hospitals to the Public Health Service.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

TAX REFUNDS ON CIGARETTES LOST IN THE FLOODS OF 1951

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4319) to authorize tax refunds on cigarettes lost in the floods of 1951.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMEND ACT OF FEBRUARY 15, 1923

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1081) to amend the act of February 15, 1923, to release certain rights and interests of the United States in and to certain lands conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6353) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide a national defense reserve of tankers and to promote the construction of new tankers, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ADVISABILITY OF A NATIONAL MONUMENT IN BROOKLYN, N. Y.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 582) to authorize an investigation and report on the advisability of a national monument in Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ACQUIRE PROPERTIES WITHIN MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 79) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the State of Kentucky to acquire non-Federal cave properties within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park in the State of Kentucky, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to cooperate with the State of Kentucky for the purpose of arranging for the eventual acquisition by the United States of the Great Onyx Cave and the Crystal Cave within the authorized boundaries of Mammoth Cave National Park. The Secretary shall deposit to the credit of a special receipt account that portion of the

annual admission, guide, and elevator fee receipts from the said park which exceeds the annual amount available to the park for management, guide, and protection purposes, which funds so deposited may be expended thereafter in payment for the said cave properties. The Secretary is further authorized to enter into such contracts and agreements as he may determine to be necessary to effectuate the acquisition of the cave properties as authorized herein.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 4, after the word "the", insert "purchase of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTEND TIME FOR ENROLLMENT OF INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2974) to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California certain Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by law, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, within 6 months after the approval of this act, is authorized and directed to add to the revised roll of the Indians of California the names of Indians who made application for enrollment within the time fixed by the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), the act approved June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), or by the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), provided he shall find such persons to be descendants of an enrollee on the revised roll approved November 24, 1951, and that such applicants were living on May 24, 1950.

SEC. 2. The amount due any enrollee living on May 24, 1950, who may have died intestate since that date, shall be paid to the surviving spouse provided such person is a descendant of an enrolled Indian of California. If neither spouse is living, the amount shall be paid to the children of the deceased enrollee. If no children exist, the amount due shall be paid to the father and mother, or the surviving parent. If the parents are deceased the amount shall be divided equally between the brothers and sisters of such deceased enrollee.

SEC. 3. Any amount not claimed by an enrollee or beneficiaries herein named within 2 years after the approval of this act shall revert to and be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum, and thereafter be subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of the Indians of California: *Provided*, That any amount due an enrollee who may have left a last will and testament, the amount due such person shall be paid as provided by the will.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress within 60 days after the approval of this act, a full and complete report of funds used and the purposes accomplished to carry out the provisions of the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), and shall include an alphabetical list of the Indians of California whose names appear on the approved revised rolls, giving the name, address, and date of birth of each such enrollee, together with such other factual information, if any, as the Secretary of the Interior may deem advisable as tending

to identify each enrollee, and 3,000 copies of each report shall be printed as a House document.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That section 7 of the act of May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), as amended by the act of April 29, 1930 (46 Stat. 259), the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), and the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189), is hereby further amended by deleting the words 'six months' in the penultimate sentence and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'until June 30, 1955.'"

"Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to Congress on or before August 31, 1955, a full and complete report of funds used and the purposes accomplished to carry out the provisions of this act and the act approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602), the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1166), and the act of May 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 189)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time for enrollment of the Indians of California, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTEND EMERGENCY AUTHORITY ON FOREIGN MERCHANT VESSELS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6318) to amend emergency foreign merchant vessel acquisition and operating authority of Public Law 101, 77th Congress, and for other purposes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF SEDGWICK COUNTY, KANS.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5183) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of the Board of County Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PERMIT FLYING OF UNITED STATES FLAG IN FLAG HOUSE SQUARE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2111) to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Baltimore, Md.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any rule or customs pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America

as set forth in the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," approved June 22, 1942, as amended, authority is hereby conferred on the appropriate officer of the State of Maryland to permit the flying of the flag of the United States for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Albemarle and Pratt Streets, Baltimore, Md.

Sec. 2. Subject to the provisions of section 3 of the joint resolution of June 22, 1942, as amended, authority is also conferred on the appropriate officer of the State of Maryland to permit the flying of a replica of the flag of the United States which was in use during the War of 1812 for 24 hours of each day in Flag House Square, Albemarle and Pratt Streets, Baltimore, Md.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXCESS-LAND PROVISIONS SHALL NOT APPLY TO OWL CREEK UNIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4721) to provide that the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the excess-land provisions of the Federal reclamation laws shall not apply to lands in the Owl Creek unit of the Missouri Basin project, authorized in section 9 (a) of Public Law 534, 78th Congress, approved December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887).

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF OFFICIALS OF THE FORT PECK TRIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6154) to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, or such official as may be designated by him, is hereby authorized, until otherwise directed by Congress, to advance to the tribe or to pay out of any unobligated tribal funds of the Fort Peck Indians in the Treasury of the United States salaries and expenses of tribal officials or representatives at rates and/or limitations designated in advance by the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided*, That the length of stay of representatives serving the tribe at the seat of government shall be determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. The act of July 1, 1947, is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "tribe" and insert "tribes."

Page 1, line 10, after "Interior", insert "and to advance to the tribes or to expend tribal funds for such other purposes as may be designated by the Fort Peck Tribal Executive Board and approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 2, line 4, strike out "tribe" and insert "tribes."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "July 1, 1947" and insert "April 28, 1948 (62 Stat. 203)."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Fort Peck Tribes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRIBES OF FORT BELKNAP TO ACQUIRE INTERESTS IN TRIBAL LANDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4481) to authorize enrolled members of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., to acquire interests in tribal lands of the reservation, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the Fort Belknap Community Council of the Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Tribes of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., is hereby authorized to dispose of tribal lands within the boundaries of such reservation to any enrolled member of the Gros Ventre or Assiniboine Tribes upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe. Title to any land conveyed under this act may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian owner.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, after the period, strike out "Title to any land conveyed under this act may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for the individual Indian owner." and insert "A fee patent to land conveyed under this act shall be issued to the individual Indian owner, except where the Secretary finds such owner is incompetent. In the case of any such exception, title to any land conveyed under this act to an incompetent individual Indian owner may be taken in the name of the United States in trust for such owner."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RULES FOR PRACTICE IN COURTS OF APPEALS FOR REVIEW OF DECISIONS OF TAX COURT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1067) to authorize the Supreme Court of the United States to make and publish rules for procedure on review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code be amended by adding at the end thereof a new section, as follows:

"§ 2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

"The Supreme Court may prescribe, and from time to time amend, uniform rules for filing petitions, preparation of records, and

the practice, forms, and procedure, in the United States Court of Appeals in proceedings for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States.

"Such rules shall neither abridge nor enlarge the substantive rights of any litigant.

"Such rules shall not take effect until they have been reported to Congress by the Chief Justice at the beginning of a regular session thereof but not later than the 1st day of May, and until the expiration of 90 days after they have been thus reported."

SEC. 2. The chapter analysis of chapter 131 of title 28 of the United States Code immediately preceding section 2071 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"2074. Rules for review of decisions of the Tax Court of the United States."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "procedure", insert "except as to qualification for admission to practice."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF THE ARMY TO CONVEY CERTAIN LAND TO THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8045) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain land located in Windsor Locks, Conn., to the State of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill (S. 489) be considered in lieu of the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed to convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to the State of Connecticut all right, title, and interest of the United States, except as retained in this act, in and to the following described land in Windsor Locks, Conn., together with all buildings, improvements therein, and all appurtenances and utilities belonging or appertaining thereto, such land including approximately fifty-eight and six hundred eighty-five one-thousandths acres and formerly designated as the Post Engineer Area of Bradley Field, as shown on maps on file with the Office of the Chief of Engineers:

PARCEL ONE

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route No. 75 and the northern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence north along the east line of Connecticut Route No. 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of sixty feet more or less; thence north fifty-three degrees ten minutes east, a distance of five hundred and eighty-eight feet more or less; thence north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of four hundred seventy-three feet more or less; thence north seventy-eight degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of three hundred and forty feet more or less; thence south sixty-six degrees twenty-five

minutes east, a distance of two hundred and sixty-two feet more or less; thence south seventeen degrees forty-five minutes east, a distance of seventy-seven feet more or less to the northerly boundary of the fifty-foot right-of-way of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence along the northern boundary of such railroad spur, south seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes west, a distance of one thousand five hundred and eighty-five feet more or less, to the point of beginning.

PARCEL TWO

Beginning at the intersection of the eastern right-of-way line of Connecticut Route No. 75 and the southern right-of-way line of the spur track of the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad; thence easterly along the southerly right-of-way line of such spur track, north seventy-two degrees fifteen minutes east, a distance of two thousand six hundred and thirty-five feet more or less; thence south seventy-one degrees thirteen minutes east, a distance of one hundred eighty-three and five-tenths feet more or less; thence south eighteen degrees nine minutes west, a distance of one thousand three hundred and ninety-five one-hundredths feet more or less; thence north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and seventy-nine feet more or less; thence south twenty degrees ten minutes west, a distance of five hundred seventy-six and twenty-four one-hundredths feet more or less, to the northerly line of highway Connecticut Route No. 76; thence westerly, along the northerly line of Connecticut Route No. 76, north eighty-three degrees thirty minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and thirty-six feet more or less; thence north twelve degrees no minutes east; a distance of seven hundred and fifteen feet more or less; thence north eighty-five degrees no minutes west, a distance of seven hundred and five feet more or less to the easterly line of highway Connecticut Route No. 75, thence north along the easterly line of Connecticut Route No. 75, north one degree forty-six minutes thirty seconds west, a distance of thirty feet more or less to the point of beginning.

SEC. 2. All mineral rights, including gas and oil, in the lands authorized to be conveyed by this act shall be reserved to the United States.

SEC. 3. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon condition that such property shall be used primarily for training of the National Guard and for other military purposes, and that if the State of Connecticut shall cease to use the property so conveyed for the purposes intended, then title thereto shall immediately revert to the United States, and in addition, all improvements made by the State of Connecticut during its occupancy shall vest in the United States without payment of compensation therefor.

SEC. 4. The conveyance of the property authorized by this act shall be upon the further provision that whenever the Congress of the United States declares a state of war or other national emergency, or the President declares a state of emergency, and upon the determination by the Secretary of Defense that the property conveyed under this act is useful or necessary for military, air, or naval purposes, or in the interest of national defense, the United States shall have the right, without obligation to make payment of any kind, to reenter upon the property and use the same or any part thereof, including any and all improvements made thereon by the State of Connecticut, for the duration of such state of war or of such emergency. Upon the termination of such state of war or of such emergency plus six months such property shall revert to the State of Connecticut.

SEC. 5. In executing the deed of conveyance authorized by this act, the Secretary of

the Army shall include specific provisions covering the reservations and conditions contained in sections 2, 3, and 4 of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 8045) was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FORT UNION NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1005) to authorize the establishment of the Fort Union National Monument, in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to preserve and protect, in the public interest, the historic Old Fort Union, situated in the county of Mora, State of New Mexico, and to provide adequate public access thereto, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire on behalf of the United States by donation, or he may procure with donated funds, the site and remaining structures of Old Fort Union, together with such additional land, interests in land, and improvements thereon as the Secretary in his discretion may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 2. Upon a determination of the Secretary of the Interior that sufficient land and other property have been acquired by the United States for national-monument purposes, as provided in section 1 of this act, such property shall be established as the "Fort Union National Monument" and thereafter shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable to national monuments. An order to the Secretary, constituting notice of such establishment, shall be published in the Federal Register.

Following establishment of the national monument, additional properties may be acquired as provided in section 1 hereof, which properties, upon acquisition of title thereto by the United States, shall become a part of the national monument: *Provided,* That the total area of the national monument established pursuant to this act shall not exceed 1,000 acres.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "act," insert "Donated lands may be accepted subject to such reservations, terms, and conditions as may be satisfactory to the Secretary, including right of reversion to donor, or its successors and assigns, upon abandonment as a national monument, and reservation of mineral rights subject to condition that surface of donated lands may not be used or disturbed in connection therewith, without the consent of the Secretary."

Page 3, line 3, after the word "acres," insert "exclusive of such adjoining lands as may be covered by scenic easements."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE OF THE WOODS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2098) to provide for the compensation of certain persons whose lands have been flooded and damaged by reason of fluctuating water levels.

tuations in the water level of the Lake of the Woods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]?

There was no objection.

EDEN PROJECT, WYOMING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7057) to authorize the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to transfer, exchange, and dispose of land in the Eden project, Wyoming, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to assure the most beneficial application of the available water supply to lands within the Eden project, Wyoming, established pursuant to the provisions of the item entitled "Water Conservation and Utility Projects" in the Interior Department Appropriation Act of May 10, 1939 (53 Stat. 685, 719), as amended, including the act of June 28, 1949 (63 Stat. 277), and to facilitate land settlement and land use:

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in his discretion and when the public interest will be benefited thereby—

(1) to exchange public lands in the State of Wyoming, within or without the boundaries of the project, for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the exterior boundaries of the project which are adaptable for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities;

(2) upon concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture public lands within the exterior boundaries of the project which are suitable for development and settlement; and

(3) for the purpose of consolidating Federal holdings of lands in the project, upon concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture, to exchange public lands in the State of Wyoming, within or without the boundaries of the project, for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the exterior boundaries of the project which are suitable for development and, upon consummation of such exchange, the lands received in exchange shall thereupon become a part of the project and subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized and directed—

(1) when in his judgment the public interests will be benefited thereby, to exchange lands under his jurisdiction within the exterior boundaries of the project for non-Federal lands of approximately equal value within the boundaries of the project which he finds are suitable for project development and settlement; and

(2) upon concurrence of the Secretary of the Interior, to transfer to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior lands or interests in lands which are adaptable for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities, or are unsuited for incorporation into farm units and are surplus to the needs of the project.

(c) (1) The lands transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of section (a) (2) and received in exchange under the provisions of sections (a) (3) and (b) (1) shall be developed, settled, disposed of and otherwise administered in the same manner as acquired project lands; and (2) the lands transferred to the jurisdiction of the Secre-

tary of the Interior under the provisions of section (b) (2) shall be administered under the public land laws, excepting lands transferred for use in the construction, operation, or maintenance of project irrigation facilities which, together with the lands received in exchange under the provisions of section (a) (1), shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in all respects the same as other project lands under his jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING ENTRY OF PHILIPPINE TRADERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8092) to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, upon a basis of reciprocity secured by agreement entered into by the President of the United States and the President of the Philippines, a national of the Philippines, and the spouse and children of any such national if accompanying or following to join him, shall, if otherwise eligible for a visa and if otherwise admissible into the United States under the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163), be issued a visa and admitted into the United States under the provisions of section 101 (a) (15) (E) of said act if entering solely for the purposes specified in subsection (i) or (ii) of said section.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this bill—to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders—introduced at the request of the Secretary of State, places American businessmen in the Philippines and Philippine businessmen in the United States in the status normally enjoyed by so-called treaty traders.

The need for this legislation arose from the fact that in order to confer the status of treaty traders on foreign nationals in the United States, there must be a treaty of commerce and navigation in existence.

Our treaty with the Philippines has expired and a new treaty is being negotiated right now. In the meantime, however, business must go on, and it would be highly undesirable if our businessmen would have to leave the Philippines and the Philippine businessmen would have to go home during these negotiations.

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
New York, N. Y., March 3, 1954.

The Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR MR. REED: With reference to bill H. R. 8092, to facilitate the entry of Philippine traders, introduced in the House of Representatives on February 25, 1954, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce wishes to go on record as being in full accord with the provisions of this bill. We feel its early passage would materially improve United States-Philippines relations. On the other

hand, delay in the passage of this bill may result in some eventuality which may impair the friendly relations which have for so long existed between the two countries. We, therefore, urgently recommend that prompt and favorable consideration be given this bill by your committee.

May we inform you that the chamber has had under consideration for many months the views of its members concerning any modification in the present provisions of the Philippine Trade Act of 1946 and the agreement on trade and related matters between the United States and the Philippines which was entered into pursuant to that act. Our views were submitted, by letter, on December 29, 1953, to the Chairman of the Interdepartmental Philippine Trade Agreement Committee, Department of State, Washington, D. C., and incorporated in the annual report of our board of directors which was submitted to all members last January. The following is an extract from the aforementioned letter:

"(6) Immigration: Concerning the entry of Americans into the Philippines and Filipinos into the United States, we feel that an arrangement similar to the one contained in the trade agreement should be provided for in a revision of the Trade Act. We strongly support any legislation by our Congress whereby Filipinos will have treaty merchant status; any revision of the Trade Act should be reciprocal for Americans in the Philippines, such provisions to remain in effect for the duration of the Trade Act, as amended."

For your information and guidance, the Philippine American Chamber of Commerce was incorporated in the State of New York on March 18, 1920, to foster and promote trade, commerce, mutual welfare, and other business relations between the United States and the Philippines, and their respective peoples, and to serve those persons and organizations having financial, trade, business, and professional interests in either or both countries.

A list of the officers and directors of the chamber is attached.

Very truly yours,

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE, INC.,
W. E. MURRAY, President.

THE PHILIPPINE AMERICAN CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE, INC., 1954

Officers

W. E. Murray, president; H. A. Magnuson, vice president; George Hampton, vice president; H. H. Herts, vice president; F. M. Satterfield, treasurer; Col. John F. Daye, secretary.

Directors

(Term expires annual meeting January 1955)

A. K. Aurell, vice president, Singer Sewing Machine Co.; Henry P. Byrd, area manager Philippine division, Standard-Vacuum Oil Co.; J. H. Foley, executive vice president, Ansor Corp.; H. A. Magnuson, executive vice president, Connell Brothers Co., Ltd.; F. M. Satterfield, assistant vice president, the National City Bank of New York; M. D. Thompson, chairman executive committee, Insular Lumber Co.

(Term expires annual meeting January 1956)

A. A. Alexander, vice president, American President Lines, Ltd.; Wm. Knight, Hanson & Orth; J. J. McCabe, president, Ledward, Bibby & Co., Inc.; T. H. Mitchell, president, RCA Communications, Inc.; W. E. Murray, manager, Central Asiatic area, California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.; H. W. Taylor, vice president, Centennial Flouring Mills Co.

(Term expires annual meeting January 1957)

K. J. Brown, vice president and secretary, American International Underwriters Corp.; Geo. Hampton, vice president, General Foods Corp.; H. H. Herts, president, Dayton, Price & Co., Ltd.; M. J. Ossorio, Victorias Milling Co.,

Inc.; L. D. Seymour, president; L. D. Seymour & Co., Inc.; L. W. Wirth, vice president, Neuss, Hesslein & Co., Inc.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIAL PRAYERS ON APRIL 18

The Clerk called the resolution (S. Con. Res. 63) requesting churches and synagogues to give special prayers on Easter Sunday for those denied freedom to worship behind the Iron Curtain.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas our country has, from its beginning, been inspired by God and its citizens throughout its history have sought His divine guidance; and

Whereas the dictatorship of communism is based upon atheism and directed toward the complete destruction of all religious worship; and

Whereas this atheistic dictatorship has subjected religious leaders and their congregations to barbaric persecutions such as the world has not seen for nearly 2,000 years, as exemplified in Hungary by the torture of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass, in Poland by the incarceration of Cardinal Wyszynski, in Yugoslavia by the imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, in Bulgaria by the oppression of Protestant ministers, and by the persecution of Jews throughout the area dominated by communism; and

Whereas millions of worshipers behind the Iron Curtain are prevented by force and violence from the free exercise of their religious beliefs and rituals: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress reverently requests the churches and synagogues of America to set aside a portion of their services on Easter Sunday and on the first day of Passover in 1954, both of which fall on April 18, for special prayers for the deliverance of all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied freedom to worship in their own fashion.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Congress", strike out "reverently requests" and insert "respectfully suggests that."

Line 4, strike out the word "to."

Line 8, after the word "own", strike out the word "fashion" and insert the word "way."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution requesting American churches and synagogues to give special prayers on April 18 (Easter and the Passover) for deliverance of those behind the Iron Curtain."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING REFUGEE RELIEF ACT OF 1953

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8193) to amend the Refugee Relief Act of 1953.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is not the purpose of this bill to reunite the families of people who are living in this country

but have relatives abroad? When the Relief Act was passed, there was a certain number designated as refugees. The demand for those to come is much smaller than the numbers needed to reunite families and the 7-month period of operation demonstrates the need for a larger number; is that correct, and is it the intention that all laws and regulations pertaining to immigration are applicable to the Refugee Relief Act and to this amendment?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is correct.

Mr. WALTER. It will not increase overall the number of people admitted?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will not.

Mr. WALTER. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee.

Under the bill it is provided to legalize the entry of those persons brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment. The report seems to limit those to Japanese brought from Peru.

I should like to ask the chairman if it is the intent of the bill to include persons of any origin brought from all American Republics for internment or for the convenience of the Government of the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in the law which would confine this to Japanese nationals. It applies to anyone brought into the United States for internment from any other country.

Mr. KILDAY. From all the American Republics?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. KILDAY. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subdivision (c) be added to section 4 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 401), to read as follows:

"(c) Any allotments of visas provided in paragraphs (5) and (6), paragraphs (7) and (8), and paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) of this section, shall be available bilaterally within each of the three ethnic groups therein defined."

Sec. 2. Subdivision (c) of section 5 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 403) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The assurances required in this section shall be in lieu of the assurances required in section 7 of this act, and the provisions of section 7 (d) (2) shall not apply to eligible orphans as defined in this section."

Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 6 of the Refugee Relief Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 403) is hereby amended to read as follows: "Any alien who establishes that prior to July 1, 1953, he lawfully entered the United States as a bona fide nonimmigrant and that he is unable to return to the country of his birth, nationality, and last residence because of persecution or fear of persecution on account of race, religion, or political opinion, or who was brought to the United States from other American Republics for internment, may, not later than June 30, 1955, apply to the Attorney General of the United States for an adjustment of his immigration status."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATISTICS OF REDCEDAR SHINGLES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2348) to repeal the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize the Director of the Census to collect and publish statistics of redcedar shingles," approved May 25, 1937 (50 Stat. 204, 205) be, and it is hereby, repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RIGHTS OF PRIORITY OF NATIONALS OF JAPAN AND CERTAIN NATIONALS OF GERMANY AS TO APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6280) to extend temporarily the rights of priority of nationals of Japan and certain nationals of Germany with respect to applications for patents.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the rights of priority specified in section 1 of Public Law 690, 79th Congress, approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 940), which arose before April 1, 1950, are hereby extended, with respect to inventions made subsequent to January 1, 1946, in favor of nationals of Japan, and of nationals of Germany, excluding persons residing in or subject to the jurisdiction of the zone of Germany occupied by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Soviet sector of Berlin or other areas of Germany under Soviet or Polish administration, to a date 9 months after the enactment of this act, subject to the conditions and limitations specified in sections 1, 4, 10, 12, and 15 of said Public Law 690.

For the purpose of this act, the phrase "passage of this act" in said Public Law 690 shall be understood to refer to the date of enactment of the present act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOUNDARY AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALABAMA AND FLORIDA

The Clerk called the resolution (H. J. Res. 347) giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Alabama and the State of Florida establishing a boundary between such States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Alabama passed an act designated as act No. 440, Senate bill numbered 231, which was approved by the Governor of such State on August 28, 1953; and

Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida passed an act designated as chapter 28141, Senate bill No. 1155, which was approved by the Governor of such State on June 12, 1953; and

Whereas such acts both provided in substance that upon ratification, confirmation, and adoption of such acts by the Congress of the United States, the boundary between

south States at the mouth of the Perdido River, and adjacent thereto, should be as follows:

The middle of the Perdido River at its mouth, as defined by the Constitutions of the States of Alabama and Florida, is at latitude thirty degrees sixteen minutes fifty-three seconds north and longitude eighty-seven degrees thirty-one minutes six seconds west as the control point;

That the boundary line at the mouth of Perdido River is fixed, as nearly as may be, in the axis of the mouth of said river, passing through the control point and running north and south and having as its northern terminus a point of latitude thirty degrees seventeen minutes two seconds north and longitude eighty-seven degrees thirty-one minutes six seconds west, and as its southern terminus a point one thousand feet due south of the control point;

That from the northern terminus of the boundary line at the mouth of the river, the boundary up the lower portion of said river be a straight line to a point of latitude thirty degrees eighteen minutes no seconds north, longitude eighty-seven degrees twenty-seven minutes eight seconds west, thence by a straight line to a point in the center line of the Intracoastal Canal at longitude eighty-seven degrees twenty-seven minutes no seconds west;

That the seaward boundary between Florida and Alabama extends from the south end of the boundary line at the mouth of Perdido River, thence south no degrees one minute no seconds west to the seaward limit of each respective State; and

Whereas such acts of the States of Alabama and Florida constitute an agreement between such States establishing a boundary line between them: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby given to such agreement and to the establishment of such boundary, and such acts of the States of Alabama and Florida are hereby approved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERANS DAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7786) to honor veterans on the 11th day of November of each year, a day dedicated to world peace.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act making the 11th day of November in each year a legal holiday," approved May 13, 1938 (52 Stat. 351; 5 U. S. C., sec. 87a), is hereby amended by striking out the word "Armistice" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "Veterans."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REES of Kansas, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted at the action of the House in approving H. R. 7786 because I know that it will meet with universal approval by veterans, veterans organizations, and the public generally. I may say that before I introduced this legislation I con-

sulted with the representatives of veterans organizations. As indicated by the report of our House Committee on the Judiciary, the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Disabled American Veterans all took official action approving this bill and urging its adoption.

I should also like at this time to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the Honorable CHAUNCEY W. REED, of Illinois, and to the Honorable WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, before which I appeared and presented the need for passing this legislation.

This legislation will change the name of Armistice Day to Veterans Day. I have long felt that the national holiday which we celebrate on November 11 of each year has lost its original significance. It was originally dedicated to the cause of world peace, and was intended to honor the veterans of World War I. The date November 11 was, of course, chosen to commemorate the close of that First World War.

The United States has now been involved in many great military efforts, and each has produced its number of veterans. We all realize that it would not be feasible to establish a national holiday to commemorate the closing of each war. This legislation does not establish a new holiday. Rather, it expands an existing holiday so that we may honor all veterans at the same time.

I sincerely trust that the other body, following the action we have taken here today, will approve this legislation at an early date in order that appropriate plans may be made for the first national celebration of Veterans Day in 1954.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 7786, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, my friend [Mr. REES], has much appeal to veterans of my district and apparently to veterans everywhere. This expression of opinion of war veterans is exemplified in the newspaper article that appeared in the Evening News, published at Harrisburg, Pa., on November 12, 1953, expressing the views of veterans in that area to setting aside one day to celebrate the ending of all United States wars.

H. R. 7786, and an identical bill introduced by me, H. R. 8299, provides that the 11th day of November of each year, now known as Armistice Day, be dedicated to world peace honoring all veterans. Aside from this one day, sentiment in the above-mentioned article, as well as sentiment among my own comrades in the veteran posts of which I am a member, favors May 30 as a tribute to the hero dead. A constituent of mine, who also is a very good friend and who had served as a paratrooper in World War II, brought the desirability of such an observance to my attention following a small turnout at a recent Armistice Day parade; this convinced him that

one day should be designated as a celebration of all of our war endings, including the more recent conclusions known as V-E Day, V-J Day, and V-K Day, meaning of course, victories in Europe, Japan, and Korea. This distinguished soldier to whom I have reference is Lt. Joseph Snecinski, of Hartford, recent zone 1 commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, and like myself is a member of Post No. 51, PLAV. Zone 1 includes the State of New York and the New England States. H. R. 7786 has, I feel, the complete support of the Members of the House of Representatives, and I congratulate the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], and include herein the fine article that was written by C. William Britsch:

SENTIMENT RISES FOR SETTING ONE DAY TO CELEBRATE END OF ALL UNITED STATES WARS

(By C. William Britsch)

Is Armistice Day losing its significance?

Are V-E Day, V-J Day, and other war anniversaries, generally observed on Memorial Day, crowding Armistice Day into oblivion?

World War I and World War II veterans prominent in servicemen's activities disagree whether observance of the anniversary of World War I's end is waning.

MERGED OBSERVANCES FAVORED

But a majority of those interrogated feel that one day should be set aside for celebration of the end of all wars in which the United States has participated.

And a majority felt, further, that the end of all United States wars should be celebrated on Armistice Day by a display of our military might, with Memorial Day retained exclusively for paying tribute to the war dead.

This opinion was shared by Luther G. Smith, State commander of the Military Order of the Purple Heart and president of the Pennsylvania Joint Veterans' Council.

"November 11—Armistice Day—is an established date and should be designated a national holiday by Congress to celebrate the end of World War II and all United States wars as well as the end of World War I," Smith said.

OPPOSES MIXED OBSERVANCES

"Instead of mixing the observance with memorial services and similar ceremonies, it should be celebrated by a gigantic display of America's armed might. Memorial Day should be retained for the purpose its name signifies—to honor our men and women who lost their lives in the service of our country in all our wars."

The Purple Heart commander added that he favored retaining the little known observance of August 8, anniversary of the founding of the Purple Heart by Gen. George Washington at Newburgh, N. Y., in 1782, to honor those men who were wounded—the living wounded—in all United States wars.

Frank Crispino, commander of Pvt. Earl E. Aurand Post 1086, Veterans of Foreign Wars, likewise favors the Armistice Day date for an armed might celebration of the end of all United States wars and Memorial Day for tribute to the memory of all war dead.

DIMINISHED OBSERVANCE

"Armistice Day has lost its popularity and will continue to diminish in importance unless it is set aside for the one big celebration of the end of all our wars," Crispino said. "Veterans' groups should get behind the idea of a single celebration of the end of all our wars on Armistice Day with emphasis on keeping the Memorial Day observance just that, but for the dead of all wars."

Brig. Gen. A. H. Stackpole, who will become commanding general of the 79th Infantry Division, United States Army Reserve,

January 1, did not agree that Armistice Day is losing its identity.

"Very little, it seems to me, despite the dates of later wars' end," he replied in answer to the question. "Until Congress decides that there shall be one day devoted to observing the end of all wars in which our country fought, November 11 will be observed with pride and proper remembrance."

Lloyd C. Pike, past State commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, expressed an opposite view. He said: "Definitely it has lost much of its identity."

"Armistice Day never was celebrated as it should have been; it's not even a business holiday generally," he added. "Fewer persons are participating each year. World War I and all other United States wars' end should certainly be celebrated on one day if justice is to be done to those we desire to honor."

"We should devote as much attention to the Armistice Day of World War II as that of World War I," said Lt. Spero W. Calos, adjutant of Detachment 8, 2021st Army Service Unit, stationed at the local Army and Air Force recruiting station.

"Living in a day of merging and consolidation," he said, "I would favor one day for the celebration of the end of all our wars. I have noticed that the Armistice Day celebration is waning."

"I don't think Armistice Day is losing its identity, because it's being celebrated today as it always has been in the United States and France," Frank Heidel, State adjutant of the Military Order of the Purple Heart, said.

"But I do feel that Armistice Day should be designated officially for celebration of the cessation of hostilities of all our wars with an Armed Forces demonstration. To make it the success it should be we should dispense with other similar celebrations."

"And Memorial Day, which is primarily to honor the dead of the Civil War, should be extended by legislation to include honoring the dead of all our wars."

FAVORS AUGUST 14 PROGRAM

Oscar N. Tingley, immediate past commander of Post 27, American Legion, last August advocated designation of August 14—V-J Day—"as a sort of 'National Preparedness Day' to bring the Armed Forces Day or National Defense Day, and a few others of similar character into one special observance that would show us to the world in bright, mighty light."

"Instead of an outright memorial—a period of regret and remorse, or solemnity and ceremonials—it is highly possible that the thousands of young men who never came back would want something to show the might of their Nation to the rest of the world so that any possible aggressor of the future would think twice before starting something that would take additional lives from our land," he continued.

J. Hugh McNeill, commander of Post 27, American Legion, said he plans to advocate for Harrisburg a 1-day celebration of the end of all United States wars because he believes the popularity of Armistice Day is declining.

"The Armistice Day parade idea is losing its appeal," he said. "People are not turning out to watch the parades as they did prior to World War II. And the older veterans have reached a point where they don't care to march and the younger ones won't march. As a result the Armistice Day parade amounts to nothing much more than a procession of National Guard and Reserve units and paid bands."

"I'd favor elimination of the Armistice Day parade next year because even those men left who still are willing to parade cannot get away from work and cannot afford to take the day off. I favor one day for a celebration of the end of all our wars and this should be a demonstration of our military might."

WANT EQUAL RECOGNITION

In increasing numbers those who fought in World War II are clamoring for equal recognition of V-J Day.

Likewise, some veterans of European fighting in World War II feel that its end—V-E Day—should be observed with a separate and fitting celebration.

Eventually these demands by veterans' organizations, many feel, will lead to separate celebrations with parades and other ceremonies detracting from Armistice Day's importance unless the 1-day celebration is adopted.

Some legal or public holidays, such as Independence Day, Memorial Day, and Armistice Day, are taken for granted by Americans as national holidays.

Actually there are no national holidays in the United States. The President and Congress designate legal or public holidays only for the District of Columbia and Federal employees.

SINGLE INSTANCE NOTED

The only instance of Congress declaring a national holiday throughout the United States appears to be in an act of March 2, 1899, which used the expression with reference to April 30, 1889, the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States.

Each State sets its own holidays by legislative enactment or executive proclamations. Usually the individual States have followed Federal designation of legal holidays.

An outstanding conflict followed President Franklin D. Roosevelt's designation of a different day from the traditional fourth Thursday in November as Thanksgiving Day. He moved it ahead 1 week but many States ignored his proclamation.

Whether Armistice Day is losing, or will lose, its prominence seems to depend upon action of the veterans themselves.

EXCHANGE OF LAND BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND PUERTO RICO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1548) to provide for the exchange between the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico of certain lands and interests in lands in Puerto Rico.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the land identified in section 2 hereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real estate briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

(a) A strip of land alongside of Munoz Rivera Avenue, San Juan, and east of Army medical building, containing four and eight-tenths acres; the site of the San Sebastian Guardhouse at 205 Sol Street, San Juan, containing five one-hundredths acre; old walls around La Fortaleza containing sixty-six one-hundredths acre; driveway to Insular Department Justice containing eleven one-hundredths acre, and all shown in detail on drawing numbered 15-02-142, dated August 15, 1951, entitled Fort Brooke Military Reservation.

(b) Punta Las Marias Military Reservation, comprising eighty-seven one-hundredths acre, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-150, dated November 24, 1948, entitled Punta Las Marias SL and FC Site.

(c) Punta Cangrejos (Battery Lancaster) Military Reservation, comprising fifteen and eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-114, dated November 10, 1948, entitled Battery Lancaster (No. 264) Military Reservation.

(d) Punta Maldonado Military Reservation, comprising one acre, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-151, entitled Punta Maldonado SL and FC Site.

(e) Mata Redonda Military Reservation, comprising ninety-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and one and eighty-one one-hundredths acres of roadway easements, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-155, dated December 3, 1948, entitled Mata Redonda Gun Emplacement Site.

(f) Point Lima Military Reservation, comprising one-hundred thirty-five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and nine acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-152, dated November 24, 1948, entitled Point Lima Gun Emplacement Site.

(g) Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation, comprising nine hundred six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 48-01-160, entitled Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation.

(h) Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation, comprising seven and five one-hundredths acres and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-180, dated August 17, 1949, entitled Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation.

(i) Tract 16 of Salinas Maneuver Site, comprising three hundred sixty-nine and ninety-eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing numbered 18-01-126, dated November 1, 1948, entitled Salinas Maneuver Site.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accept from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without cost to the United States, a conveyance by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the lands briefly identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

Area numbered 1 comprising about one thousand and four hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the upper one-half of the east boundary of the existing Salinas Maneuver Site and area numbered 2 comprising about five thousand and one hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the west and north boundaries of the reservation. These areas are shown on drawing numbered 15-02-24, dated April 10, 1951, entitled Expansion of Salinas Maneuver Site.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"TITLE I

"Sec. 101. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in exchange for the land identified in title IV hereof, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to real estate identified in titles II and III and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army.

"TITLE II

"Sec. 201. Those lands acquired by the United States of America, without payment of compensation, under the Treaty of Paris and set aside for military purposes by Executive order, dated June 30, 1903, identified as follows:

"(a) A strip of land alongside of Munoz Rivera Avenue, San Juan, and east of Army medical building, containing four and eight-tenths acres; the site of the San Sebastian Guardhouse at 205 Sol Street, San Juan, containing five one-hundredths acre; old walls around La Fortaleza containing sixty-six one-hundredths acre; driveway to Insular Department Justice containing eleven one-hundredths acre, and all shown in detail on drawing No. 15-02-142, dated August 15, 1951, entitled 'Fort Brooke Military Reservation.'

"(b) Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation, comprising seven and five one-hundredths

acres and shown on drawing No. 18-01-180, dated August 17, 1949, entitled 'Fort Mayaguez Military Reservation'.

"TITLE III

"SEC. 301. Those lands acquired by the United States of America through condemnation proceedings and payment of just compensation as determined thereby, identified as follows:

"(a) Punta Las Marias Military Reservation, comprising eighty-seven one-hundredths acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-150, dated November 24, 1948, entitled 'Punta Las Marias SL and FC Site'.

"(b) Punta Cangrejos (Battery Lancaster) Military Reservation, comprising fifteen and eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-114, dated November 10, 1948, entitled 'Battery Lancaster (No. 264) Military Reservation'.

"(c) Punta Maldonado Military Reservation, comprising one acre, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-151, entitled 'Punta Maldonado SL and FC Site'.

"(d) Mata Redonda Military Reservation, comprising ninety-eight and forty-seven one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and one and eighty-one one-hundredths acres of roadway easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-155, dated December 3, 1948, entitled 'Mata Redonda Gun Emplacement Site'.

"(e) Point Lima Military Reservation, comprising one hundred thirty-five and eighty-two one-hundredths acres of fee-owned land and nine acres of roadway, electric transmission line, and water pipeline easements, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-152, dated November 24, 1948, entitled 'Point Lima Gun Emplacement Site'.

"(f) Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation, comprising nine hundred six and eighty-nine one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-160, entitled 'Camp O'Reilly Military Reservation'.

"(g) Tract 16 of Salinas Maneuver Site, comprising three hundred sixty-nine and ninety-eight one-hundredths acres, and shown on drawing No. 18-01-126, dated November 1, 1948, entitled 'Salinas Maneuver Site'.

"TITLE IV

"SEC. 401. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to accept from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, without cost to the United States, a conveyance by the Governor of Puerto Rico of the lands identified below and more fully described on maps and in descriptions on file in the Office, Chief of Engineers, United States Army:

"(a) Area No. 1 comprising about one thousand four hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the upper one-half of the east boundary of the existing Salinas Maneuver Site and area No. 2 comprising about five thousand one hundred acres of rural and agricultural lands abutting along the west and north boundaries of the reservation. These areas are shown on drawing No. 15-02-24, dated April 10, 1951, entitled 'Expansion of Salinas Maneuver Site'.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1827) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to disclaim any interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the State of Washington.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized to disclaim any and all right, title, lien, or interest of the United States in and to certain property located in the city of Seattle, Wash., King County, Wash., hereafter described as follows:

A portion of West Canal Street and Burns Avenue NW., described as follows: Beginning at the southeast corner of lot 16, block 3, Ross addition; thence on the south line of said lot south eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds west seven and forty one-hundredths feet to the true place of beginning; thence south thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes west ninety feet to a point on the north line of the Lake Washington Canal; thence following the said north line to the most southerly corner of lot 8, block 1, Seattle tide lands; thence along the easterly and northeasterly lines of said lot 8 to an intersection with the southeasterly line of that portion of Burns Avenue Northwest as vacated by ordinance numbered 76354; thence following said southeasterly line northeasterly to an intersection with the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest; thence following the northeasterly line of Burns Avenue Northwest and West Canal Street southeasterly to the true place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of West Bowdoin Place, formerly West Fortieth Street: Beginning at the southeast corner of block 6, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence south thirty-nine degrees six minutes no seconds west one hundred thirty and eighteen one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on the said northerly line, northwesterly four hundred forty-eight and seventy-eight one-hundredths feet; thence north thirty-nine degrees thirty-one minutes east sixty-nine and sixty-six one-hundredths feet to a point on the north line of said block 6, Ross addition; thence on said north line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east thirty-one and seventy-three one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred seventy-five and twenty one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block; thence on said line north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east sixty-three and twelve one-hundredths feet to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street), together with a portion of Sixth Avenue Northwest: Beginning at the northwest corner of block 8, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the west line thereof south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-six and two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal Street; thence on said line southeasterly three hundred forty and fifty-one one-hundredths feet to a point on the south line of said block 8; thence south thirty-eight degrees sixteen minutes no seconds west ninety feet to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly three hundred fifty-eight feet, more or less, to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees fifty-six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning; also,

A portion of West Canal Street (formerly Ewing Street): Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 4, block 9, Ross addition to the city of Seattle; thence on the north line of said block north eighty-nine degrees thirty-eight minutes thirty-two seconds east forty-five and twenty-two one-hundredths feet to a point on the northerly line of West Canal

Street, as established by ordinance numbered 14267; thence on said line southeasterly two hundred seventy-eight and thirty-nine one-hundredths feet to a point on the east line of said block 9, which said point is south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east twenty-two and sixty-four one-hundredths feet from the northeast corner of lot 11 of said block; thence on the east line of said block and the same extended south no degrees twenty-one minutes twenty-eight seconds east one hundred and forty-eight feet, more or less, to a point on the northerly line of the Lake Washington Canal right-of-way; thence on said line northwesterly to a point that bears south thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds west from the place of beginning; thence north thirty-eight degrees six minutes no seconds east to the place of beginning.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 31]

Abbutt	Fine	Metcalfe
Addonizio	Fino	Miller, Nebr.
Allen, Ill.	Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.
Barden	Forrester	Morano
Barrett	Fulton	Morgan
Battle	Gamble	Morrison
Becker	Granahan	Moulder
Bentley	Green	Multer
Bentsen	Gwinn	O'Brien, N. Y.
Boland	Halleck	O'Neill
Bolling	Hardy	Osmer
Bolton	Harrison	Patten
Francis P.	Nebr.	Pelly
Bosch	Harrison, Va.	Philbin
Boykin	Hays, Ohio	Powell
Bramblett	Heller	Preston
Brownson	Hoeven	Radwan
Buckley	Holifield	Rivers
Busbey	Holtzman	Roberts
Byrne, Pa.	Hosmer	Rodino
Canfield	Hruska	Rogers, Mass.
Celler	Javits	Roosevelt
Chelf	Jensen	Scherer
Chudoff	Jonas, Ill.	Sheehan
Church	Jones, N. C.	Shelley
Clardy	Kearns	Sheppard
Condon	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Cooley	Kelly, N. Y.	Simpson, Pa.
Corbett	Keogh	Taylor
Crosser	King, Calif.	Thompson
Curtis, Mo.	King, Pa.	Mich.
Curtis, Nebr.	Klein	Tollefson
Davis, Tenn.	Kluczynski	Tuck
Dawson, Ill.	Krueger	Velde
Dingell	Lane	Warburton
Dollinger	Latham	Weichel
Donohue	LeCompte	Wilson, Ind.
Donovan	McConnell	Winstead
Dorn, S. C.	McCormack	Yorty
Evins	Mason	
Feighan	Merrill	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 312 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit on the bill H. R. 7839, the housing bill, while the House is engaged in general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan.

There was no objection.

CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1955

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8367) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue during the remainder of the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and myself, and that the first paragraph of the bill be read before the Committee rises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding, then, that the bill will not be taken up under the 5-minute rule today, but that it will be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Simply the first paragraph of the bill will be read today.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8367, with Mr. McGEORGE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is my responsibility to bring before the House for discussion and debate the bill to provide appropriations for the civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year 1955.

The appropriations recommended by the committee amount to \$430,983,700. This is a reduction of slightly over \$34 million from the budget estimates submitted to us and \$10,609,000 less than the appropriations for these purposes during the current year.

When our subcommittee made its report to the full committee on last Thursday, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, as well as of the full committee, made the remark, and certainly he speaks from very broad experience in the field of appropriations and other legislation, that he considered this to be probably the most difficult bill to handle that fell to the lot of any subcommittee. I suspect that the members of the subcommittee who have labored diligently in bringing this bill to the House will agree with the statement that was made at that time. We can and do take a great deal of satisfaction in the fact that we feel that we are bringing a bill to you which deals with a very important matter, and of which all of us are proud.

This year the major load for presenting the requests of the Corps of Engineers to us was handled by General Chorpene, the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Civil Works. It is our understanding that before the sun sets today, General Chorpene will have received his orders for another assignment. I know that the members of the subcommittee would not like to have him leave us, because we did appreciate the broad knowledge that he had of his problems and the great candor with which he presented these matters to our subcommittee. If he must leave, we would not like to have him leave without wishing him well in whatever his new assignment may be.

I think the task of our subcommittee was eased by the complete sharing of responsibility and the harmony and spirit of self-denial that existed among all the members who held the hearings on this bill, because there was that complete harmony and cooperation among the members.

This comes to you as a subcommittee bill. It is not the architecture of any one member, although I suppose it could be said that there are individual items with which some of us might have individual differences. Nevertheless, it does represent the cooperative effort of the subcommittee to bring a reasonable and sensible piece of legislative appropriation to you.

I think everyone recognizes, in spite of some of the less complimentary names that have been attached to this particular appropriation, that it does deal with some of the greatest resources of our Nation. In fact, all of the members of our subcommittee just came from the White House, where we witnessed the pressing of the button that started the first generator at the Fort Randall Dam in South Dakota. In connection with the few remarks the President made, he referred to our water resources not as one of the greatest but as the greatest single resource of our Nation.

Last year we recognized the need for a better coordinated water resources program. Our report dealt with that problem at some length. This year we reiterate our feeling that there is a need for that greater coordination, and we continue to feel the urgency of the development of a sound water-resource program for our Nation. We can take some as-

surance and some pleasure in the fact that a considerable amount of progress has been made in the course of the last year in arriving at better coordination and better leadership in the development of that program. We have been able to discern a noticeably better coordination, for instance, between the Department of the Interior and the Corps of Engineers. Their methods and calculations as to allocation of costs are getting closer and closer, so that we anticipate that by the time this bill reaches the floor next year those difficult differences that have existed will be erased and we will have a uniform method of handling at least these problems in the Congress.

I think the story of this particular bill is concisely told in the report which is before you. As was the case last year and in the 2 previous years before that, we adhered to some ground rules. For instance, every project included in this bill and every amount for each project set forth in this bill and in the report was previously approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Because of the large backlog of projects of this kind, because of the need for complete cooperation between the legislative and the executive branches in order to keep a reasonable and a concise program, the subcommittee for the past 3 years has felt that we were entitled to, in fact, that it was a necessity that we have all projects screened by the Bureau of the Budget before we presented them to the Congress. Seventeen new starts are included in the bill for this year which represents a departure from the approach that we took last year. These starts, generally speaking, are in conformance with some definite criteria. They are projects that either represent completely new starts or are resummptions of important construction projects that have been delayed by reason of the Korean incident. For the most part, they are small in overall scope, and entail a maximum amount of cooperation both as to endeavor and as to the money at the local level. There are no new multiple-purpose starts in this bill. I think that is completely consistent with what I have said because the multiple-purpose starts are much larger in scope, and the money involved is much greater. It was felt and our subcommittee felt that we are not yet ready to embark upon large, new projects at that time. I think in that connection it is worth comment that during the discussion of this bill in the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] said:

It is no longer proper to refer to this as a flood control and navigation bill any more.

He pointed out, as you can note from page 7 of our report, that out of some \$276,500,000 in this bill for construction, \$192,500,000, in other words, more than two-thirds of the appropriations contained in this bill, as recommended to you, goes for multiple-purpose projects.

I think you can find the information that you will be interested in with respect to each of the projects in the report. As a general proposition, the amounts recommended conform quite

closely to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, and where you find deviation from the budget recommended amounts, the explanation will be found in three things:

First, that we felt that a lesser amount of money would do the job than the executive department suggested ought to be done; or, second, that there are unobligated or unexpended balances from this current year or previous years that permit a lessening of the appropriation in the 1955 bill; or, third, that there are certain specific conditions with respect to the project which are clearly set forth and explained in the text of the report.

Mentioning briefly the field of general investigations, we do not and have not, for at least during the time that I have been familiar with this appropriation, attempted to specifically earmark certain amounts for certain investigations. If you wish to determine the tentative allocation of the Corps of Engineers for various studies, I suggest that you look in volume 1 of the hearings starting on page 107 where the Corps of Engineers has set forth its tentative allocations subject to this warning, however, that these are tentative. If you find a figure there for a certain study, or even if you find a certain study listed in the course of the fiscal year, it may not happen that the project will be studied and that that particular amount of money will be used on that study because those are tentative and subject to greater need or reduction in funds that may develop in the course of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HOLMES. May I ask the chairman of this subcommittee why the investigation money for Ice Harbor was stricken from the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. You are talking about planning money. I will come to that in a few minutes, if you will bear with me.

In the field of planning, projects are definitely listed. There again we have not set forth any specific amounts, but we have listed the projects for which planning funds are to be used during the 1955 fiscal year out of the funds included in this bill. You will find a list of those projects on pages 4 and 5 of the committee report.

In "Operation and maintenance" we have, generally speaking, allowed the amount in full that was recommended to us. As we said last year in our report, we felt that we are building up a backlog of construction difficulties and construction troubles unless we do provide necessary funds in order to operate and maintain the structures which have already been built.

Generally, I believe that furnishes the information that is required in order to permit an understanding, and to pave the way for the discussion that some of you perhaps will want to engage in with respect to these various projects.

Turning to the question asked by my colleague from Washington [Mr. HOLMES], we have been informed, at least twice in the past to my knowledge,

that the planning work on Ice Harbor had been completed. In times past we have had requests for construction funds submitted to our subcommittee. It is our feeling that they have had sufficient planning funds on this project to have completed that job. We just do not like the idea of being told twice before that the planning would be done if we provided a certain amount. We provided substantially those amounts, and here is request No. 3 for additional funds. Basically speaking, I think that is an answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. HOLMES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In other words, we think the planning is done or ought to be done.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I would like to ask the very competent chairman of this subcommittee if he will amplify the reasons why he objected to the appropriation of \$500,000 for the Kawaiuli Swamp project on the island of Oahu. I might say before the gentleman answers the question that I am prompted to make this inquiry after reading the hearings in which I noted a feeling that you and other members apparently had that this project was primarily of private rather than a public interest. I would like very much to know why the gentleman has that feeling, in light of the report that has been made and the history of the project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure that I know what the gentleman is referring to in the hearings. My recollection of this is that this request for Federal funds was made at a time when the city and county of Honolulu was contemplating embarking upon what is substantially a reclamation project. In other words, the draining of this swamp and the use of that land for a residential development.

I would say in summary, that after looking at the project we could not quite picture it as being entirely a Federal flood-control project. In our minds it more closely resembled a reclamation project, and it appeared to us that the city and county of Honolulu were in a position and had the power to handle this problem at the local level.

Mr. FARRINGTON. If I might have a little further time, I do not know whether the gentleman has inspected this area himself or not.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have not.

Mr. FARRINGTON. It is near the approach to the Kawaiuli Naval Air Station, which had been taken over by the United States Marines for their only permanent overseas regimental combat team base. Admiral Radford at the time he was in command in Honolulu recommended that this project be undertaken in order to relieve a condition that had developed recently as a result of heavy rains; and that not only threatens the population that had settled in that area because of floods, but also the military area because of the insanitary conditions that result.

This is a project that has been under study for a period of more than 10 years

and twice has been set aside only because of the war.

I would like to ask, if the gentleman will permit me a minute to read a portion of a telegram I received from the Governor of Hawaii with respect to this project.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. FARRINGTON. I wired the Acting Governor, Farrant L. Turner, about the action of the committee and in reply he said to me in part:

Great floods in March 1951, impelled Territorial Legislature to appropriate funds for small channel along Federal project alignment as emergency relief, contemplating completion of project by United States Corps of Engineers. Project in critical unfinished condition pending anticipated Federal improvements approved by Congress.

Emergency expenditures were made to protect from inundation because Federal Government had deferred action on account of World War II and later Korean conflict. Territorial funds spent as stopgap only and along right-of-way committed for Federal project. Denial of Federal project will result in great damage by floods overtopping emergency channel. Great need for protection from floods resulting from rainfall up to 20 inches in 24 hours. Emergency channel inadequate to carry.

That concludes the excerpt from the Acting Governor's wire.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of that wire and the fact that this project was recommended by Admiral Radford, that you will reconsider your point of view and support an amendment to restore this project to the bill. I thank the gentleman very sincerely.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I shall be glad to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have heard what the Delegate from Hawaii had to say with reference to this project. I have had the opportunity to see the project and I want to say that it impressed me very favorably. I was out and inspected it and talked with Admiral Radford about it. But I rise at this time for another purpose.

I came in a little late and I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, chairman of the subcommittee that handled this bill, this question: If he has outlined his tests, the rules, under which these new projects, 20 of them, I understand, were brought into the bill as construction projects? If you have not I would like very much to have you outline the criteria which you used in bringing them in.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I have mentioned that there are 17 new projects in the bill. They are either new starts or the resumption of previously started projects that were discontinued for one reason or another, and the reason in most instances was the Korean incident. Now they are being brought in. The general criteria established was that they must not be large and expensive projects that will require work over a long period of time, and that they receive a maximum amount of local contributions financially and otherwise for the completion of the project.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. May I ask the gentleman another question, then? Is it going to be the purpose of the subcommittee in the future to use as criteria, a necessary criteria, the maximum amount of local contribution in flood control and rivers and harbors projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Things are moving in that direction. The executive department of the Government is attempting now to set up some specific rules that will provide for considerably greater local contribution than has been the case in the past.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That will be the case regardless of what action the Congress has taken in regard to a project already approved? In other words, even though the Congress has approved the project and authorized it, we are to understand that the subcommittee lays out as a criterion that local contributions are in order and the greater the contribution the more likelihood of the project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is a pretty fair assumption of the situation, all other things being equal.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I wanted to clear that up in my own mind.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Did I understand the gentleman to say that the projects outlined to which consideration was given in reference to expenditure for studies for 1955 are outlined on pages 108 and 109 of the hearings?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Pages 107, 108, and 109.

Mr. HARRIS. That includes navigation and flood-control projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee to say that this is merely for information of the Members of Congress and others interested and that the engineers in the various districts might very well not spend the money for this purpose but allocate it to some other project which they might deem in a particular district was more important?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes. I want to make it clear that those projects and those amounts on the pages of the hearing referred to do not represent a definite specific commitment by the Corps of Engineers to pursue their studies, either at all of those particular places or in those particular amounts.

Mr. HARRIS. How much funds are included in this bill for studies of flood control projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe we have broken it down for flood control projects only.

Mr. HARRIS. "Examination and surveys \$1,950,000." Is that the amount available?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct and is the amount for all examinations and survey projects.

Mr. HARRIS. "Collection and study of basic data, \$460,000." What does that have reference to?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. For the most part it is general information that

is required for a particular river basin or for a group of these projects. It is general information that can be applied in respect to any of the projects. It is information that is collected in cooperation with other Government agencies.

Mr. HARRIS. The planning money provided here, that is, for studies, and so forth, is allocated from the Corps of Engineers' office in Washington—or is it divided up and allocated to districts throughout the United States?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman is speaking of planning funds now?

Mr. HARRIS. No; I am talking about studies.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. It is allocated out of the Engineers' office here.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, it is not divided up and allocated to districts or divisions under the Corps of Engineers in the field before it is sent out of the Engineers' office here in Washington?

Mr. TABER. The whole thing is gathered together here. It is divided up before it comes down to us.

Mr. HARRIS. Wherever it is needed throughout the country.

Mr. TABER. They say that. Of course, there are enormous sums of money piled up that they can use and change those allocations to a considerable extent. They have the authority to do that.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for this additional question about another project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman is aware, of course, that there is a budget estimate, and I want to express my appreciation to the committee for including the funds budgeted for Little Missouri River below Murrefreesboro. This is a project that was authorized in 1942, and the multipurpose that goes with it known as Narrows Dam was completed in 1950. That is the work below the multipurpose dam and reservoir. There is a small tributary on the Little Missouri River which the committee, of course, is aware I am interested in, and the estimated cost is anywhere from fifty to seventy-five thousand dollars. It has been my feeling that the amount budgeted could not only take care of the channelizing of the Little Missouri River but also these few miles on this tributary that is so badly needed in the area. Could the gentleman advise me whether or not consideration was given to including that tributary within this budget limitation?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not able to tell the gentleman that it is included in there because the Corps of Engineers did not in its presentation to us indicate that the funds were to be used on that tributary. I suppose that a proper construction of the hearings and of the amount included would be that there are no specific funds for that tributary included in the bill.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say to the gentleman that two figures from the

Corps of Engineers were presented, one was given a year ago and one was given this year in February, and from the variation of the figures they have given at two different times during the year I am fully convinced that this whole job can be completed with the funds budgeted here. If that is true, perhaps the committee objects to this small tributary being included in this category.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not suppose we would be in a position to object. As a matter of fact, the Corps of Engineers at no time informed us that they contemplated doing any particular piece of work with the money included in this particular appropriation.

Mr. HARRIS. And they also advised the committee that it would cost about fifteen to twenty thousand dollars more doing it piecemeal than doing it all at one time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I believe that is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. A year ago I received a considerable amount of registered mail regarding Libby Dam in Montana. I notice on page 5 of the report that Libby Reservoir is included in the bill to receive some funds for continuing a study of it. Now, is that a study of the same plan or is it a new plan?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is a considerably different project than we had before us last year. We did, however, recommend planning this last year because we knew they were contemplating making this change of site in order to obviate a great many difficulties they had with respect to relocations and some difficulties in working out an arrangement with the Canadian Government. I think we are on pretty sound ground in going ahead with the planning of this project as we now know it.

Mr. DONDERO. There were two difficulties involved: One, it backed water into Canada and would subject the United States to a large bill for damages, and the other one a relocation of about 100 miles of railroad.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In 1946 a project in Arizona was authorized known as the Whitlow Ranch Dam. Was there any consideration given that project by the Committee on Appropriations at this time?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It was not presented to the committee to the best of my recollection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I notice on page 4 of the report there is an amount of \$2.2 million to be expended for the planning work, and subsequent to that figure there is a list of projects.

Is there any understanding by the committee as to how much will be spent on each project, or will that be left to the discretion of the Corps of Engineers?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Generally speaking, the corps did in the hearings indicate the amount that they intended to spend for planning on each of these projects; however, the committee reduced the amount that was requested. We also deleted perhaps 2 or 3 of the projects for which they requested planning funds, so that we expect the general pattern of their presentation to be followed. But it is not possible to say that exactly the amount of money that the Corps of Engineers recommended will be used for planning. It is anticipated, however, that money for planning will be used on each of the projects that we have listed, and with the use of unobligated balances I think it is safe to assume that, roughly speaking, there will be about the amount of money used for planning on each of them as the Corps of Engineers presented to us in the hearings.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The hearings will disclose the approximate figures as to how much will be spent on the planning of each individual project?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Approximate figures; yes.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Washington. The bill carries appropriations for five dams in the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; McNary, \$24 million; Lookout Point, \$3 million; Albion Falls, \$4 million; Chief Joseph, \$27 million; and the Dalles, \$29 million, or a total of \$87 million.

Do these large appropriations recommended by the committee indicate that the committee is favorably disposed toward the continuation of those flood control, navigation, and power dams now under construction in the Pacific Northwest?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think the recommendation of those large amounts of money is an indication of committee opinion. I think basically it represents our recognition of the fact that once you get these projects started, the economical and reasonable thing to do is to provide sufficient funds to get them finished, so that we will begin to get returns from them.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I agree with the gentleman's statement there. On the Dalles Dam there was a carryover, unexpended balance of \$6 million. The committee has recommended \$29 million in addition. Does that mean that we will have a total of \$35 million for work on the Dalles Dam during the coming 12 months' period?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It does.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I notice that the committee has reduced the amount for the Dalles by \$5,100,000 less than the Bureau of the Budget recom-

mended. It is my understanding that that reduction was made for the reason that there was not legal authorization for that amount at this time. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] and I have introduced a bill which would provide additional authorization for the Dalles Dam construction. If that bill should pass the House in time, does that mean that the conferees, when they meet on this bill, would give favorable consideration to this \$5,100,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, provided the Senate should insert it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It would depend upon the legislative situation at that time. I do not think I am in a position to say what the conferees would do with respect to it. Our report is quite explicit on the matter. It says that the reduction is based in part on unobligated and unexpended balances estimated to be in excess of \$6 million at the end of the present year and it spells out the lack of authorization to support an appropriation any greater than that which is included in this bill.

So there are two factors, one of them the unobligated and unexpended balances, and the other lack of authorization. That is about as definite a statement as I can make in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. MACK of Washington. It is true, is it not, that when the Budget Director made the recommendation of \$34 million for the Dalles Dam, the Budget Director knew at that time that there was going to be a \$6-million carryover? I read that in the testimony at least.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have had difficulty for at least 3 years that I know of with the fact that the authorization has been trailing behind the construction program in the Columbia Basin.

Mr. MACK of Washington. That is correct. And that has been due primarily to the fact that we have not had a river and harbor authorization bill for a period of 4 years. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I should like to ask a question similar to the question asked a minute ago. The speaker indicated strongly then that if he knew just what the hearing showed maybe he could tell something better. With reference to the Greenup Dam down at Greenup, Ky., and across the Ohio River, I have traced this through just about as far as the gentleman went and considerably further in this respect, and I have here just what was said in the hearings. There is the figure of \$50,000. According to the gentleman's deductions, I think we can feel safe in believing, then, that that \$50,000 will be carried in the appropriation.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Substantially so, yes. It would be improper for me to say categorically they are going to spend \$50,000 for planning on this project, but in conformance with the information I gave the gentleman from Alabama, I think the gentleman is safe in

saying that that is substantially the amount that will be available.

Mr. JENKINS. Anyway, the Army engineers here indicated that \$50,000 was the round number, and the chances are that the gentleman's committee in going through their work included it in this approximately \$2,200,000 that covers that category of work.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Substantially so, yes.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. May I sincerely compliment the chairman and the members of the subcommittee on bringing in this bill. I understand they came back here last fall and worked several weeks. We know they have been in session night and day, sometimes 2 and 3 sessions a day.

I am also tremendously gratified that I finally got two little projects in my home district, in Barbourville, Ky., and Pineville, Ky.

There is one thing on which I would like to have a little advice. Our folks are constantly in fear of a devastating flood. I am wondering just how soon my friend thinks we will have enough funds to complete the project. I understand the Army engineers gave the chairman and the members of the committee some idea of how they could get along with that work. Of course, we do not have any protection from the floods, to build the walls high enough to stop the river. We are thankful for what we have received; but we would like to know what rules you have adopted or what your plan is to continue these projects so that the ultimate protection will be afforded the people.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I would say with respect to these comparatively small projects about which the gentleman from Kentucky is inquiring that it is certainly the policy of our subcommittee to push these projects along in order to get the benefit from them about as rapidly as the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget believe they can be completed in an orderly fashion.

Mr. GOLDEN. May I say for the Record that the people there have furnished all the money the Government has required and there is a splendid spirit of cooperation in helping the Engineers to build them as soon as possible.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I have in mind projects that are comparatively small ones, where the local cities or organized municipalities have already appropriated funds and have funds available to carry on these smaller flood-control projects. Are there funds in this legislation that would help projects of that kind? I have in mind levees especially.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not sure enough of what the gentleman is referring to to be able to answer that question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Here is a case where levee projects have been approved, not large ones, around cities where they have formerly had floods, and where, for

instance, a city has, on the theory it would get help from the Army engineers, raised funds by issuing bonds or otherwise. Anyway, they have the funds on hand to carry on the project. This project having been approved by the Army engineers, are there other funds in this appropriation to match such funds?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Not unless you find them specifically referred to in the report.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was under the impression that there were funds for that purpose generally, but not specifically.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; not generally. Oh, there are some of the smaller projects such as snagging and clearing and things of that kind. There is also a general fund for use where the project is small and of an emergency nature. If I understand the gentleman's question correctly, I would say that unless he finds in the report a specific reference to that project, with an amount of money listed, the answer probably is that there are no funds for those particular locations.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I was impressed with the gentleman's replies to inquiries made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks] when he made inquiry with respect to funds that might be available to match the funds of municipalities.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We are moving in that direction in an effort to get the greatest possible amount of local contribution and local cooperation in these flood-protection projects.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. In my section of the country, and I know there are a number of other States, too, we have local boards on levees. Does the gentleman mean that the committee will take into consideration the amount of funds which the local levee board is expending on similar projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; the gentleman is speaking about the maintenance now, is he not?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Principally maintenance, but when you get into a levee project, it is difficult to distinguish between maintenance and new work in many instances.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have a rather general formula at the present time where the local interests, for instance, are required to make contributions usually within four categories such as rights-of-way and things of that kind. I think we are moving in the direction of more substantial local contributions along that line, but as of this date we cannot say, or at least we cannot definitely say what those criteria are going to be for future appropriations.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGER. I would like to ask a question, referring to the committee report on page 7, with regard to the Redwood City Harbor. You state there in the last sentence that there is not complete agreement as to the need and as to

compliance with the requirements of the River and Harbor Act of 1950 as it concerns this project. I understand from the district engineer that this million dollars has nothing to do with the 1950 authorization. These funds are not to complete any of the work in the 1950 authorization, and the work required of the local port has all been completed. The district engineer out there was quite concerned about this, and telephoned about it, and could not understand why the point was brought up. Does the gentleman know anything about that?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The particular million dollars, requested this year, does not refer specifically to the 1950 River and Harbor Act. Our discussion was on the general overall proposition of the Federal contribution for the improvement of the Redwood City Harbor. Last year we had a million dollar request for one particular phase of the work. It did not materialize. Now they come back with a request for the same amount of money. I think the committee has to know pretty well what we are getting into before it allows a million dollars for any specific part of the development of that project. That is the basis for the reference to the 1950 act, which I understood required local development of some terminal facilities and so on that have not been completely built. The entire authorized project must be considered as a whole.

The report does refer to Federal appropriations for the overall development at Redwood City. I think that is the light in which this language needs to be considered.

Mr. YOUNGER. They have the whole thing set out in an answer. Would there be any objection to inserting that in the Record at this point?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Wisconsin certainly is not in a position to object to any insertion or statement you might want to make with respect to it.

Mr. YOUNGER. I understand that is improper in Committee of the Whole, so I will make that request when we go back into the House.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. GEORGE. I notice on page 107 of the report seven items in the Great Lakes Division for planning money on harbors which have to do with navigation sites.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Those are studies; not planning funds, but studies.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand, but is that tied up in any way with the St. Lawrence Seaway, in anticipation of greater traffic in those harbors?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I could not tell you whether it is specifically tied up or not. I would guess that probably they have no connection, in view of the fact that the seaway has not been authorized yet, and these surveys have been under way for some time.

Mr. GEORGE. This is a continuing program of study that has been going on for years?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to express the appreciation of one city in Oklahoma for the very courteous hearing which was afforded to the city's representatives by the chairman, at a very late hour in the day, when they presented a case to the committee for a Federal contribution for a flow line for the city of Muskogee. According to my information, the Engineers' report on the city's testimony was received after this bill had been marked up. May I presume from that that judgment by the committee has not been passed as yet, on the merits of the Army engineers' position, and the city's position with regard to the flow line?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We were aware that in view of the fact that your people were not satisfied with the original Corps of Engineers' report, that a subsequent study of this matter must be made. We had not yet received the results of that study at the time we marked up this bill.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I understand that that subsequent report from the engineers has now been received by the committee, and I wonder if it is possible that that report would be taken into consideration in your conference with the Senate, if a conference results on this bill, which I presume it will.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I think that is a safe estimation to make. I have not personally studied the report as yet.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. LOVRE. First, I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for a job well done, which has been a tough job, and I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman and his committee for the personal inspection trip that he and his committee made in my district last year.

With reference to the Oahe Dam in South Dakota, I notice the gentleman from Wisconsin asked General Potter what the target date on that project was. General Potter stated that the first power is scheduled to come on the line in December 1961, and the closure would be 1958. It is my further understanding that there is \$9 million in this particular bill. I believe that is correct?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is correct.

Mr. LOVRE. With that \$9 million can the target date be met, and can this dam be closed in 1958 with power in 1961?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. All I can say in response to that question is that we have the testimony of General Potter. He gave us the target date. He testified in support of the specific amount of money. The subcommittee recommended that amount of money in full. So I suppose that that question might better be directed to General Potter and the Corps of Engineers than it would to this subcommittee, but the subcommittee acted consistently with the recommen-

dation of the Corps of Engineers that was presented to us.

Mr. LOVRE. I thank the gentleman. I do want to make one comment and that is this: The question of power is very imperative in South Dakota. We do have a shortage of power, a number of our REA's are short of power today. It is necessary for them to have a reasonable assurance that this dam will be completed so they can make their plans, and I certainly hope this particular dam can be completed in 1958 and that we can take the power in 1961 which is the time schedule as of now.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I would like to express my congratulations to the committee. I think they have done an amazing job. I have just a few questions in connection with Los Angeles County, for which was allowed an area item of \$8,500,000. As I understand, that money can be used on any flood-control project within the Los Angeles flood-control area with the approval of the Army engineers and the flood-control engineer of Los Angeles County.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not believe it is quite that flexible. The Corps of Engineers did present a breakdown on parts of the overall project where they plan to spend the money that they requested. We fulfilled the request that was made, a request made, I am sure, after very close coordination between the Corps of Engineers and the people who are so active in this work at the local level in Los Angeles County. So I would feel that you would have to look to the hearings and find there the items that were requested in this overall amount and then assume from that, that inasmuch as the committee did approve the amount in full that those are the places that this money is going to be spent.

Mr. McDONOUGH. In that connection, there is no item here under the hearing date that you refer to for the Saw Pit Dam, which is the dam immediately in the vicinity where the great burnoff was last fall and where the menace of floodwater coming off the hills at that point is going to be very dangerous to the people below.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not know just where in the hearings the gentleman is looking.

Mr. McDONOUGH. At page 240.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. But you will find, however, there is testimony on that problem. You will find that your colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND] appeared before the committee as soon as that burn occurred, and the Corps of Engineers are working I think admirably well on that situation. They suggested and the Bureau of the Budget approved the suggestion and revised their recommendation to our subcommittee that this \$500,000 which had previously been allocated to the Whittier Narrows Dam should be used in order to get into the handling of this Saw Pit problem just as soon as the funds in this bill are made available. That is included in the \$8,500,000 allowed by the

committee, a discussion of that will be found on page 241 of part I of the hearings.

Mr. McDONOUGH. That is fine; I appreciate that, except from page 240 of the hearings there is no estimate, nothing is set aside for it. So if the explanation of the chairman is sufficient to allocate us that \$500,000 to be used to carry out the Saw Pit Dam project, that will hold the floodwater back in that area; and we are very happy to hear that.

The only other question is that in the channelizing of the Los Angeles River which is included in the \$8,500,000 and which I understand has proceeded now up to a point in the San Fernando Valley and will proceed farther. I understand that the Army engineers in doing flood-control work and channelizing in Los Angeles County can use any part of the \$8,500,000 and that they can proceed as far as the funds are available.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not familiar enough with the details to tell you whether or not they did specify any particular place in the course of the hearings. I cannot recall that detail clear enough at this time.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HOLT. The part of the Los Angeles River we are discussing, Mr. Chairman, is out in my district. It is my understanding that—I know—the money has been appropriated to carry the Los Angeles River project from Saplupa Boulevard to Reseda Boulevard. It was understood, I think, that the Army engineers would recommend other appropriations at this time to the Bureau of the Budget to get the present construction completed. As I understand, it is in the overall planning. It is planned, as I understand it, in the overall program in Los Angeles County to continue this progressive program in connection with the gentleman's committee. I want to compliment the chairman, also the subcommittee, for the fine job they have done in coming out there and inspecting that project.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. I would like to inquire as to the amount appropriated for general investigations on page 3. In connection with No. 1, examination and surveys, do the Army engineers determine where the money is to be spent or has it been earmarked for certain projects?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It has not been earmarked for certain projects. The committee provides the amount in a lump sum; however, if the gentleman will look at page 107, volume 1, of the hearings, you will see there and on the following pages a list of the tentative allocations of the total amount provided.

Mr. LANHAM. Under (2) collection and study of basic data, \$460,000; just what does that authorize?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I mentioned that earlier. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that in large

measure it represents studies on problems of a general nature. For the most part, they are conducted in cooperation with other Government agencies, such as the Weather Bureau, the Geological Survey and other agencies of the Government.

Mr. LANHAM. It does not apply to collecting basic data on projects that have not yet been authorized?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I do not suppose you could say that it refers to any specific project. It is a study of matters of a general nature, information which for the most part is required for all projects or an entire basin or things of that kind.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee on appropriations for civil functions brings to you today for your consideration the 1955 version of the civil functions appropriation bill. The civil functions bill is a multipurpose appropriation. It covers funds for the National Cemetery operations, for the Old Soldiers' Home, which funds for the Old Soldiers' Home are taken from funds which are collected from the Regular Army people for this purpose; it covers funds for the operation of the Panama Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company. These funds, of course, come from tolls which are collected from the Panama Canal.

Then in the regular civil functions appropriation there are funds for the construction and maintenance of harbors, inland waterways, navigable rivers, flood control, some irrigation, and multipurpose projects, which include dams for the production of hydroelectric power, one of which the President this morning pressed a key to start operating the first generating unit at Fort Randall. The bill carries an approximate total, as the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin has told you, of \$431 million. That is \$34 million less than the requests made this year and \$10 million less than was carried in the same bill last year. Out of the \$278 million earmarked for construction work, approximately \$200 million of the money appropriated is for large multipurpose projects: Operation and maintenance of Government facilities, \$72 million; general expenses, \$9 million; Mississippi River and its tributaries to try to take care of flood control on that great river, a little over \$45 million; Niagara River remedial work, \$2 million. As the chairman has told you, there are 17 new or resumption projects included in this bill. The total, however, for these resumptions, or these new projects, whichever you choose to call them, is less than \$16 million, showing that these projects are of a rather small nature. The local people or local districts have contributed to 14 of these projects, so they are largely of a local nature. I mention this because there has been some question of the committee in regard to some very needed and very worthy projects all over the Nation. In this year of all years when we are trying to reduce Government expenses, trying to get the expenditures more nearly in balance with income, it behooves us to

make sacrifices. And, of course, a great many sacrifices are made in this bill. The Representatives all over the country are interested in developing our natural resources, particularly our water resources, that the President referred to this morning as one of our greatest resources. I note in passing, as shown by what the President had to say this morning in turning on the first unit of power at Fort Randall, that civilization has, to a large extent, followed pure water, and those countries which are most backward today are the ones that lack adequate and pure water for their use and purposes. We, in this country, are blessed with this great natural resource, and it behooves us to take care of it.

Mr. Chairman, the report which is brought to you today is strictly a bipartisan report and recommendation. Some of the members of the committee had projects in which they were interested, but they have foregone trying to exert pressure or influence for their projects, because they felt that they had no more right to ask for their projects, or the projects in which they were interested, than the other Members of the Congress. So we have adhered to the time-honored policy of not recommending anything that had not been previously recommended by the budget. We have consequently restricted our recommendations of appropriations to those projects which the budget recommended. It is true that we have not rubber stamped everything the budget presented to us. We reduced some and cut out others concerning which the information, in the opinion of the committee, was not sufficient to warrant appropriations at this time. As to some of them we felt additional information was needed. As to others there was some difference of opinion among the people in the communities where these proposed projects were to be carried out. Where there was violent differences of opinion, the committee felt that these opinions should be reconciled before the committee attempted to step in and make an appropriation.

I should like to thank the members of the committee for their consideration, their patience and their courtesy. The minority members of the committee were extended every courtesy. The witnesses who appeared before the committee, I am glad to report to this House, were extended every courtesy and every consideration.

The committee regrets that it is not able to take care of all the projects that appeared to have merit. But we have only so many dollars, as you know, to spend this year and so we had to cut the garment to fit the cloth. I hope very much that this House will see fit to go along with the committee in its recommendations.

It has been a difficult job to decide which of these projects should have appropriations and which should not. But in the larger projects the committee adopted the policy of continuing those projects which they felt could not, from an economic standpoint, be deferred without loss to the Government. That has been the policy all the way through,

that those projects which would cost money to defer have had their requests for appropriations approved. In the multipurpose projects, of course, the sooner you get power on the line and produce electricity, the sooner the Government will begin to get returns from its investment. All of these multipurpose projects, I remind the House, are based on a 50-year amortization schedule and the rates of electricity are based on this 50-year amortization schedule. Those that do not fit within this criteria, of course, do not measure up to the standards which are necessary for the committee to recommend appropriations. Again I want to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that this is a bipartisan report from the committee. While there were some differences, we have brought this to you with a united front and I hope the House will stand by its committee and pass this bill.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Is there any money in this bill to start new multipurpose projects?

Mr. RILEY. No, there is no money in this bill for new multipurpose projects.

There is considerable money here for planning projects which have been authorized. I believe the gentleman is interested in one project between South Carolina and Georgia, which, by the way, is not in my district, but is in my State. Fifty thousand dollars has been tentatively allocated to the project which, the Army engineers tell me, will complete the plans for the project and it will not be necessary to appropriate any further money for planning until construction actually starts or until appropriations for construction work are actually made.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I hope we can get enough funds to start construction next year.

Mr. RILEY. I share the gentleman's hope.

Mr. REAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REAMS. This is with reference to page 109, volume I of the hearings, and relates to the Detroit district, Maumee River, Ind. and Ohio project. It calls for flood-control studies. The question is this: The total estimated cost of that study is \$187,200. One hundred and fifty thousand seven hundred dollars was allocated through the fiscal year 1954. Twenty thousand dollars is supposed to be allocated for this year, the fiscal year of 1955. Was the unexpended balance from last year carried over into this year?

Mr. RILEY. Yes.

Mr. REAMS. So whatever was not used in the fiscal year 1954 will be available in addition to the \$20,000 which is allocated for this year?

Mr. RILEY. That is my understanding, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

Mr. PASSMAN. I rise in support of the bill before you which provides appropriations for the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers for fiscal year 1955. This action on my part does not mean that I am satisfied with the bill. To be perfectly frank, I am disappointed over the amount that the committee has recommended for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. In expressing disappointment, however, it is only proper that I state that the committee allowed the full budget recommendation for this project.

When we speak of the lower Mississippi and its tributaries we speak of the main stem Mississippi River and off-river projects in seven States, namely, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, Tennessee, and parts of Missouri, Kentucky, and Illinois.

The Congress in its wisdom authorized an expenditure of \$1,292,748,500 for this important project. Through fiscal year 1954, the Congress had appropriated \$348,770,400. The overall project is now approximately 66 percent complete and we have reached the stage in construction where we need larger rather than smaller appropriations for this tremendous project to be completed on the most economical basis. The request before you is the smallest amount recommended for this all-important project in 9 years.

Some of us have been critical of the Budget's methods and recommendations; however, I consider that without the Budget's recommendations on all appropriations, the Congress would be greatly handicapped. I believe that the Bureau of the Budget serves a great purpose and, with few exceptions, I have supported the Budget's recommendations. I am of the opinion that if we should ignore the Budget's recommendations in making appropriations, we would sooner or later find ourselves completely confused as to what the many Federal agencies actually need to operate successfully.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is understood by all that certain of our colleagues are called upon to assume greater responsibilities than others. Some assignments are harder than others. In my candid opinion, those Members assigned to the Army Civil Functions Appropriations Subcommittee have one of the most thankless and difficult tasks of any committee in the Congress, and even though at time I find myself in disagreement with the committee, I want to say for the Record that in my considered judgment no committee in the Congress is comprised of a more conscientious and fair group of men. The members of this committee sit for weeks and months listening to witnesses and well organized delegations from every section of the United States, and certainly it is an impossibility to act favorably upon the requests of all the witnesses. May I say this, that after observing the members of this committee in action for several years and understanding the hard tasks assigned to them, it is disappointing to hear them occasionally attacked by those without knowledge of their difficult assignment.

I am a member of the Appropriations Committee and also president of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. Incidentally, the compensation I receive as president of this great association is strictly limited to the satisfaction of seeing the work in the Valley States progress. As president of the association I appeared before the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee, along with many witnesses from the seven Valley States, and requested the committee to increase the Budget's recommendations from \$45,200,000 to \$56,885,000. The committee did not choose to follow our recommendations, therefore, I am following the committee's recommendations. Let me explain my position further.

During the recess last year, I returned to Washington and discussed the recommendations for this fiscal year with the Chief of the Corps, General Sturgis. Later, I returned accompanied by Senator McCLELLAN and others for a conference with Mr. Dodge, Director of the Budget, in behalf of appropriations for the Lower Mississippi and its tributaries. Evidently, we did not make as good a case as we desired.

This further prompts me to follow the committee's recommendations and there are other reasons why I am supporting the committee.

For instance, on Wednesday of this week we will consider a tax-reduction bill, and I predict that a great majority of the Members of this House will vote for tax reductions. We cannot continue increasing appropriations and reducing taxes unless we subscribe to deficit financing, which I am personally against.

Even though I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am not a member of this particular appropriations subcommittee. It is my understanding that there are one or more members of this subcommittee who need funds badly for projects in their respective districts, some of these funds on a matching basis, but steadfastly refuse to ask the committee to recommend funds because to do so would go beyond the budget's recommendations. This is certainly commendable and is positive proof of this committee's sincere effort to be realistic, fair, and impartial and do the proper thing even though its individual members may suffer certain embarrassment by not requesting funds for needed projects in their respective districts.

There are other reasons why I am supporting the bill. For instance, there are many other important projects that I hope to see the Congress authorize this year that will require funds that are equally as important as the lower Mississippi and its tributaries or, for that matter, other projects for which this bill provides money. For example, there is the St. Lawrence seaway project which, in my opinion, should be authorized. For many years I opposed this great project blindly and, may I confess, without actually reading the Corps of Army Engineers' reports. Those of us who have taken the time to study the St. Lawrence seaway project, without a doubt, will admit that it is meritorious, and I hope that a sufficient number of the Members have familiarized themselves

with this project to be able to support the measure when it reaches the floor of the House. I might state further that the many reports and justifications I have read convince me beyond a doubt that the Congress would be making a mistake not to authorize this important project during this session of the Congress.

It is going to be necessary for the Congress to increase the authorization for additional work on the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. The Mississippi River Commission, an agency of the United States Government, declared on April 23, 1952, that the Atchafalaya River at its confluence with Old River will, if left alone, capture the Mississippi River and change its route to the Gulf of Mexico, and could be out of control by 1965. Such a diversion, if allowed to happen, would be disastrous to the economy of the lower Mississippi Valley. It would affect the movement of world trade of the entire midcontinent, would greatly damage industries using river water for their operations, and, finally, would do untold damage to the million and one-half people in the New Orleans area who depend solely upon the Mississippi River for fresh drinking water.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. There is nothing in the gentleman's remarks that is at all parochial. His stature in this House is greatly increased by the statesmanlike statement which the gentleman has made and the splendid position that he has, not only in the House as the representative of his people but also as head of the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association. The gentleman has been a staunch supporter, and his judgment, reflecting as it does today his interest in every section of the country, brings forcibly to the attention of this House the breadth of his vision and his general outlook for the benefit of the whole country. I want to commend the gentleman for his splendid statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. I want to associate myself with the fine remarks of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] in regard to the attitude of my good friend and colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN]. It was my pleasure to spend some time on the Mississippi River with him last fall, in which I became familiar with the problems you have in the lower Mississippi River area. I was at a meeting where the president of that Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], got up before that meeting

and told them he was supporting the St. Lawrence seaway. I say that is an act of statesmanship, because whether we agree or not, there has been some violent opposition to that particular project in that section of the country.

I say to you that what is good for the Mississippi Valley area is good for the Great Lakes area from which I come, and vice versa. I hope this House will go on record for the St. Lawrence seaway when that bill comes before the House. It will be good for you people in the Southern part of the United States. I wish we had more money for you people in the Mississippi Valley area.

Mr. PASSMAN. I would like to say to my distinguished colleagues the gentlemen from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and [Mr. CEDERBERG] that I have been interested in the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for a long time. During 7 years of my tenure in the Congress I was opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway, in that I never took the time to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers. I was listening to opposition voiced by lobbyists, and I was reading opposition reports prepared by groups in some of these port cities, like New Orleans and Baton Rouge. Not until I decided to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers did I finally realize that I had been completely wrong all the way through. I want to reiterate what I said a moment ago, that if other Members from the valley States would take the time to read the reports of the Corps of Army Engineers and familiarize themselves with the merits of this program, I do not believe you would lose one vote in the entire South.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to join with other colleagues in paying a very deserved tribute to our distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN] for the splendid work and valuable contribution he has made.

As the gentleman knows, it was my privilege to appear before the Civil Functions Subcommittee in support of adequate appropriations for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries and urge that the amount recommended by the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association be appropriated for this purpose; and I want again to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for his valuable efforts along this line.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] for backing your President and the witnesses from the valley States when they appeared before this great subcommittee.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. There has been some discussion in the committee in regard to the interest and support of the St. Lawrence Seaway. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman

and of the members of the Appropriations Committee to the fact that 3 years ago, when this bill came before the House Public Works Committee for consideration, that the then colleague of the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Larcade, was the leader on the Democratic side in support of the measure, and time and again when the bill was acted on every representative on the committee from the Midsouth, the Deep South, voted in favor of it, not only this year but for the past 3 years.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH]. I am sure he understands, as I do, that there is great merit in the St. Lawrence Seaway program. Take, for instance, your statement concerning our former colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Larcade. It was my understanding that for several years he opposed the development of the St. Lawrence Seaway project and only changed his position in favor of the project after he familiarized himself with the reports and ascertained for himself the favorable documents submitted by the Corps of Army Engineers. He remains a staunch supporter of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Certain Members who are deeply interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway are not unmindful of the plight of the Southern States along the Mississippi. We have had appropriations to take care of it and every time we have voted in favor of them.

I just want to say one other thing; I was surprised at the conditions developed regarding the flow of the rivers down there, especially the Atchafalaya—is that name correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CEDERBERG. The gentleman knows I am a member of the subcommittee. I do not think we can afford to see a diversion of the Mississippi River channel. I am interested in it because I think it is unthinkable to let the Mississippi River divert itself, and I want to be on record as being absolutely committed on it.

Mr. PASSMAN. I want to thank sincerely the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG] for his fair and accurate appraisal of the situation.

I want my colleagues to understand that I have not changed my position with regard to the St. Lawrence Seaway in order to get more favorable consideration for the lower Mississippi River and its tributaries. For the past 7 years I have opposed the St. Lawrence Seaway project, and may I confess again that it was because I did not take sufficient time to study the reports and recommendations of the Corps of Army Engineers but rather I listened to recommendations from those who opposed this project for selfish reasons. I shall support the St. Lawrence Seaway project regardless of what is done with respect to the problems of the lower Mississippi and its tributaries.

Let me make one further observation with respect to the old river control project. The construction of this desired project will require 10 years or more, and on account of the grave emergency which has developed in the past few years, those of us residing in the lower valley, especially Louisiana, urge congressional action to secure congressional authorization together with a prompt appropriation of funds so that construction can begin and be completed before the expected crisis in 1965.

Now, may I say to Chairman Davis, of the Army Civil Functions Subcommittee, and his colleagues on the committee, that I am disappointed over the low amount recommended by the Budget for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. However, I have nothing but praise for you and your committee and the very fair and impartial manner in which hearings on the bill before the committee at this time were handled. I shall support the committee's position on the entire bill, because I want to vote for tax reduction on next Wednesday.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, in its consideration of appropriations for the civil functions of the Army for the coming fiscal year, the Committee on Appropriations was handicapped by a policy of the administration which I consider to be very ill-conceived and ill-advised at this stage in relation to the economic problems of the country. The budget submitted by the administration for all of these activities is entirely inadequate to meet the needs for the further development of this great economy of ours during the coming fiscal year. We know now that the signs of economic recession, which are obvious in many areas of the country, must be met by adequate attention to the problem on the part of private industry as well as on the part of our Government in the field of public works. All of us concede public works should be a major form of governmental activity to meet any economic recession.

The present administration, instead of offering a program to increase activity in this field, has taken steps to curtail it through the restrictions established in the budget sent to the Congress. As an overall example of what this means we might compare what the budget recommendation in this field is for the coming year with the recommendations that were made back in the years of full employment, and at a time when defense demands were even greater.

This year, in round figures, the appropriation request is in the neighborhood of \$450 million. In the past few years it has been closer to \$600 million. I submit that if we continue to cut back in the field of development and conservation of our natural resources we are going to feel it immediately in the lagging effect which that would have upon our national economy, and we are going to feel it in the long run by lack of development and lack of protection for our natural resources. This is a national problem that extends to every

State in the Union. Unfortunately, not enough attention has been paid to the whole problem to focus public indignation upon this neglect of the problem.

I am familiar, of course, with the situation that exists in my own area. I would like to call attention to my own area because it is typical of the type of activity that has been going on in regard to appropriations for this field during the past few years at a national level. I refer particularly to the lower Mississippi Valley area. For the fiscal year 1951, \$61,850,000 was appropriated for flood-control activities in the lower Mississippi Valley. For the fiscal year 1952, \$61 million was appropriated and for the fiscal year 1953, \$60,270,000 was appropriated. During all 3 of those years we were fighting the Korean war. Our entire economy was geared to that war activity, yet it was considered absolutely essential that that much of this work should be carried on, that is, to the extent of more than \$60 million a year. During the past fiscal year, the current fiscal year, the one in which we are now living, after the Korean War has been brought to a halt, the expenditures for this area were limited to \$51½ million. During the coming year it is proposed that these expenditures be reduced to \$45 million. I raise the question: Is it proposed by the administration to have another five- or ten-million dollar cutback in the budget recommendation for this vital work during another year of peacetime in which we are not fighting a war overseas? This record means the curtailment of flood-control projects which, overall, have the highest ratios of benefit of any major project in which the Government is now carrying on conservation and flood-control activities.

Mr. Chairman, to carry this record a little bit further, I would like to call attention to the type of cutback that resulted in the work in the State of Mississippi, and the work that affects the area which I have the honor to represent. For a number of years, for the past 4 years to be exact, appropriations ranging from \$9 million to \$4 million were made each year as part of the budget for the work involved here. During the coming fiscal year this budget and this bill call for an appropriation of \$908,000, a cutback of 90 percent in 4 years for work, as a part of any overall project, that has just as much benefit now as it had then. If the Bureau of the Budget continues along this pattern, the entire work will be eliminated next year. If the Bureau of the Budget continues further along this pattern in respect to the overall treatment of the conservation of natural resources in our country, there will just be no further action to conserve these resources at a national level.

Mr. Chairman, in our area the people have contributed through their tax money for more than 100 years something like \$50 million for an overall program. This has added up to between one-quarter and one-third of the overall cost of the combined Federal flood-control activity in that area. I submit that no other major project has a better percentage of local participation than in the flood-control activities in the State of

Mississippi. The major project which was eliminated by the budget, which was requested by the Corps of Engineers in its minimum estimate to the Bureau of the Budget, which was eliminated this year, is the lower auxiliary channel on the Yazoo River which provides for an auxiliary channel to be used in times of flood to get the water out of the river basin a little bit faster.

The next step in the continuance of this important project is the construction of what is termed the lower auxiliary channel. The work will consist of constructing a channel and parallel levees to form a leveed floodway, leaving the Yazoo River near Silver City, Miss., and reentering the stream at the mouth of Big Sunflower River. This is a most important element in the authorized plan and its construction will produce immediate and sizable benefits. Flood flow lines along the Yazoo River will be reduced a maximum of 7 feet, with an average reduction of 3 feet from the mouth of Big Sunflower River to Greenwood, a distance by river of some 125 miles. Practically none of the 520 miles of levees contemplated in the overall plan have been constructed, nor can they be until these major channel improvements are made since the size and height of these levees is predicated on the operation of these channels. The existing local levees along this reach will, however, not be as seriously threatened during flood periods because of this lowered flow line. Completion of this channel will also considerably reduce the length of time that stages along the Yazoo River would exceed the elevation at which minor flooding begins.

This is an item of importance. Under present conditions the emptying period flow from the reservoirs, combined with local runoff, result in outlet drainage along the Yazoo River being blocked, for all practical purposes, during the entire growing season. Completion of this channel will reduce the period of blocked drainage from near 120 days to only about 25 days. Approximately 350,000 acres in this area will be greatly benefited by the construction of this channel. Until this channel is constructed none of the other improvements necessary in the plan can be undertaken except to a limited extent. Until these improvements within the delta are made the benefits contemplated for the 1,600,000 acres along this stream will not be realized and the results from such work as has been done will be extremely disappointing. Allocations for the prosecution of this project have been substantial during recent years as shown by the following tabulation:

Fiscal year 1950.....	\$9,065,359
Fiscal year 1951.....	9,593,000
Fiscal year 1952.....	7,350,000
Fiscal year 1953.....	6,000,000
Fiscal year 1954.....	4,196,150
Average for 5 years.....	7,240,901

Excellent progress has been made through these allocations and the point has now been reached where the introduction of major improvements within the delta area are possible and the benefits to be derived from these past expenditures may begin to be fully realized. For this project to be brought to any

such abrupt and untimely halt as would result from this year's budget proposal of only \$908,000 is thoroughly illogical. The amount of \$908,000 will not complete the local protection works now under way at Yazoo City, and this figure should be increased to \$1,190,000 which will fully complete that part of the work. In addition, no less than \$2,500,000 should be provided in order that substantial progress can be made toward construction of the lower auxiliary channel.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. I yield to my colleague from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I wish to add my voice to the words of my distinguished colleague. I congratulate him for the splendid presentation which he has made, and the forthright manner in which he has presented the case for our area. I had intended speaking on the same subject, but inasmuch as the gentleman has made a much better presentation than I could have hoped to do, I will not seek time under general debate. Again, though, I wish to associate myself with the remarks which he has made.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have asked this time in order to direct a question or two to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], with reference to the Old Hickory project in Tennessee and the appropriation approved by the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations for that project.

The budget request for this project was \$14,350,000. The Appropriations Committee has approved an appropriation of \$12 million.

It is my opinion that the subcommittee would not knowingly delay this project. There is a feeling, may I say, shared by the Army engineers, particularly the district engineer in charge of the project, that, because of this cut of more than \$2 million, the project will be delayed perhaps 6 months. Feeling assured that the committee does not intend to delay the project, I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he could give me some assurance at this point as to just what effect the \$2 million reduction might have.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. In answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], I would say that there were a couple of factors in the thinking of the subcommittee that explain the cut of some \$2 million made from the budget request. First of all, there has been a loan made to this project of something in the nature of \$2 million that the Corps of Engineers contemplated repaying.

In view of the overall situation with respect to unobligated funds in the corps, it appears to be highly doubtful that there will be the necessity to repay that amount from this project. Secondly, the overall estimated cost of the project has been reduced by something over \$2 million. So there is another factor that we felt justified our reducing it by that amount.

There were 2 things, each of them involving items of \$2 million, that entered into the thinking of the subcommittee in making the reduction in the request.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask another question with reference to this loan, or this shifting of funds? I think the determination of that question possibly would answer the question of whether there will be a delay or not. I have gone rather fully into this situation. I spent a half day on this project last year when I was home during the recess. If the corps has to replace from this \$12 million the \$2 million, approximately, loaned from another fund, then I feel rather confident that there will be a delay. If they are not required to do so, then I think it is quite possible that there will not be any delay.

I am not sure whether the chairman of the subcommittee could give us any assurance that that loan would not have to be deducted from the \$12 million appropriated. I hope that he can, if the amount is to remain at \$12 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This shifting of funds is an item that has been left to the judgment of the Chief of the Corps of Engineers in order that he might have some flexibility in respect to his appropriation, in order that he could keep urgent projects going on schedule. That was done with Old Hickory. So I am not in a position to say that the corps is going to have or is not going to have to repay that \$2 million. But I think that the possibility with respect to that situation and the consideration of the decrease in the cost of the overall project makes it quite apparent that there is not going to be any harm to the orderly progress of this project by reason of the reduction that the committee did make.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure that the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee realize the importance of the completion date insofar as it relates to furnishing a pool of water for the steam plant near Gallatin. That is one of the urgent reasons why there should not be a delay in this project, also the fact that delay does not seem to be in the interest of economy.

May I ask one more question? If the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and if the subcommittee should learn later on authenticated figures that there would be a delay, the gentleman would have no objection if this amount were written in the other body. Am I justified in making that assumption?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am not prepared to commit the other members of the subcommittee and the probable conferees with respect to this, but it is not unusual at all that we do have additional information available to the committee by the time we go to conference, and we do try to take those additional facts into consideration in arriving at the final figure on every one of these projects.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman has always done that, and I am sure he will if such information subsequently is developed in this particular circumstance.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN].

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, we are very fortunate in the State of Alabama to have one of the finest river systems to be found anywhere. At the present time there are 728 miles of navigation channels, ranging from 3 to 9 feet in depth. In addition, 545 miles of river channel have already been authorized for improvement by Congress. Altogether, Alabama has over 2,100 miles of river channel. It also has one of the finest gulf ports at Mobile and 63 miles of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. These waterways handled 17½ million tons of commerce in 1951.

Reaching from Birminghamport to Mobile, the 467-mile Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway carries the bulk of all commerce moved on the inland waterways of the State. This waterway carries more commerce than all the other 27 navigable inland waterways in the southeastern coastal area from and including the Savannah River in Georgia to and including the Pearl River in Mississippi. With 1,929 miles of channel, these 27 waterways carried 1,681,802 tons of commerce in 1951, while in the same year the 467-mile Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway handled 2,712,891 tons of commerce. One hundred and fifty shippers used this waterway to move over 50 different types of commodities, and 20 different companies operated equipment on this river system.

Fourteen of Alabama's 67 counties are adjacent to the Warrior-Tombigbee-Mobile Waterway. These 14 counties contain 27 percent of the land area of the State, which directly supports 40 percent of the State's population. Thirty-five percent of Alabama's manufacturing facilities, employing 42 percent of the industrial workers, is also located along this waterway.

It would be misleading to state that the creation of this set of economic circumstances is coincidental. There are sound reasons why this condition exists, and the fundamental reason is the waterway itself. There is no question in my mind that this river system has added materially to the economic development of Alabama. Certainly Alabama's industrial and agricultural production is essential to the Nation's economy. For that production to prosper we need all forms of transportation, including a fully usable avenue of transportation in the Warrior-Tombigbee.

The development of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway has a long history and is certainly nothing new. A drive was begun as early as 1860 to have the Warrior River channeled. The first authorization was approved for the lower Tombigbee-Warrior in 1871, and the first three locks and dams on the Warrior River were built between Eutaw and Tuscaloosa in 1895. The initial phase of the channelization program continued through 1915 when the United States Corps of Engineers completed the last of 17 locks and dams on the waterway at a total construction cost of \$9.1 million. Five of the installations were of concrete construction; the other 12 were timber.

Locks and dams 8 and 9, that will be replaced by the Warrior lock and dam, were built at the turn of the century—lock and dam 9 in 1902 and lock and dam 8 in 1903.

The foresight of those responsible for the development of the Tombigbee and Warrior Rivers for navigation is demonstrated by the large tonnage carried over the waterways today and by the growth of industrial centers along these rivers.

We have now reached a time when those locks and dams built at the turn of the century must be replaced. They are not only obsolete, but worn, in some instances to the point of being dangerous.

In order to modernize the water system from Mobile to Tuscaloosa, the Corps of Engineers have made a number of recommendations.

First. The completion of the Demopolis lock and dam.

Second. Construction of the Warrior lock and dam in the vicinity of present lock 7 to replace locks and dams 8 and 9.

Third. Construction of the Jackson lock and dam in the vicinity of lock and dam 1 to replace locks and dams 1, 2, and 3 on the Tombigbee River.

Now, what has been done to date on these recommendations?

First. The Demopolis lock and dam has, as you know, been under construction for several years. The 1st session of the 83d Congress appropriated \$4½ million to continue this construction. Barring any unforeseen difficulties, this dam will be closed in August of this year, on schedule. When this is done, the job will, I understand, be about 80 percent complete.

Included in the bill now under consideration, you will find an item of \$3.4 million which will virtually complete the Demopolis installation. The committee is to be commended for including this amount, as a reduction of funds at this stage of construction would certainly not constitute an economy. I therefore respectfully urge the House to appropriate the amount for the Demopolis lock and dam contained in this bill.

Second. The remaining lock and dam to be built between Demopolis and Tuscaloosa, Ala., is the Warrior lock and dam. This structure will replace locks and dams 8 and 9. Not only are these present locks and dams dilapidated and obsolete, but many believe they are in danger of partial, if not complete, failure.

The Corps of Engineers has stated they believe that in order "to maintain navigation for 10 years over the Warrior River from the Demopolis pool to the Tuscaloosa lock and dam, it will be necessary to either build the Warrior lock and dam or to replace lock and dam 9 with a new structure and rehabilitate lock and dam 8 with a 4-month closure of the waterway."

Additional information on the dangerous condition of these structures was disclosed by a study of lock 9 made only last November by J. M. Faircloth, professor of civil engineering at the University of Alabama. The study by Mr. Faircloth, one of the outstanding civil-engineering authorities in the South, was made at the request of the Warrior-Tombigbee

Development Association with the permission of the Mobile district office of the United States Corps of Engineers.

The full Faircloth report has been thoroughly reviewed by the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, and for that reason I will refer only briefly to Mr. Faircloth's conclusions contained in the last paragraph of his report.

Mr. Faircloth states that it is his opinion that—

Both the lock and dam No. 9 are in exceedingly poor condition. To keep these structures in even a reasonable state of repair, that will permit the operation of the lock, must involve a tremendous maintenance effort—

Mr. Faircloth said:

To put them in acceptable state of repair is obviously impractical and probably impossible. While this report does not intend to suggest imminent complete failure of either the lock or dam it does not rule out the possibility of such failure.

There is, however, basis for the premise that even now there is not time for adequate replacement before failure. Structural failure to any degree will probably involve very little risk of direct damage to life or personal property, but one cannot refrain from contemplating the effect that even partial failure could have on the multi-million-dollar Government investment in the present Warrior River system as well as the effect upon private industry and the large geographical area dependent upon the facility.

The Corps of Engineers estimates that it will be necessary to spend about \$6½ million dollars in the near future on locks and dams 8 and 9 in the event the Warrior lock and dam is not constructed.

Construction of the proposed Warrior lock and dam would save annually an estimated \$157,363 in operating costs alone by the elimination of antiquated locks 8 and 9. The building of this dam would also eliminate multiple lockages now required by this waterway, and would thereby reduce considerably the time of travel. This would, of course, increase the speed of all water movements, including that of critical defense materials. At the same time, it would bring about a significant saving in transportation costs.

According to estimates made by the Corps of Engineers, the cost of building the new lock and dam to replace the two dilapidated locks and dams will be about \$19 million. The new lock and dam is designed as a modern structure 110 feet by 600 feet with a maximum lift of 22 feet.

From a long range point of view, it would appear to be much more economical to begin immediate construction on the proposed Warrior lock and dam rather than to incur the tremendous expense of repairing and rebuilding the two antiquated locks and dams. At the same time, through construction of the Warrior lock and dam, we will be continuing the program already approved by the Congress for the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee River system.

These same conclusions were evidently reached by the Bureau of the Budget. After sending an engineer to Alabama last fall to examine locks and dams 8 and 9, the Budget Bureau included in

the 1955 budget an item of \$2 million for the Warrior lock and dam.

This sum has been reduced by the Appropriations Committee to \$1.5 million and I am, of course, disappointed that the committee felt it necessary to make any reduction whatsoever. Yet, I am very pleased that the committee has wisely recognized the urgency for the immediate construction of the Warrior lock and dam by the retention of a substantial sum in the bill now under consideration.

In order that a possible stoppage of traffic on the important Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway may be averted and in the interest of long-range economy, I respectfully urge the Members of the House of Representatives to approve the sum contained in this bill for the Warrior lock and dam.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, first I want to express appreciation to this fine subcommittee for the consideration given to the testimony the witnesses presented that I caused to appear before the committee in behalf of projects in the district I have the honor to represent. However, the committee has not seen fit to recommend what we asked. I realize that the committee has many problems and cannot give every Member of Congress and every group everything the particular group would like to have. We feel that our projects were deserving and were entitled to what we asked, but the committee has taken a different position. I am not criticizing the committee, but just asking it to give the matter further consideration and study in the hope that we will get it through this Congress.

I refer particularly to the Texarkana Dam, where we had asked for a \$4 million appropriation and received a \$3 million appropriation instead, and the Ferrells Bridge project, that I feel is very much needed in the Southwest. We asked for \$1 million to start the Ferrells Bridge project, that I feel is very much needed in the Southwest. We asked for \$1 million to start the Ferrells Bridge project, but the committee decided it would not give us anything at this time. That is one project on which I am particularly asking this study, because I believe it is so deserving that eventually you will give us this starting and construction money for that very constructive and worthy project.

Notwithstanding our disappointment, we are obligated to the committee for the fine and impartial consideration that was shown our group when it appeared before your committee.

We cannot make appropriations without having the money to pay these appropriations; at least, we should not. Last year I voted against increasing the national debt limit, not that I was opposed to increasing it, because I was not, for, looking at it from my own standpoint, I feel if I vote for appropriation bills that aggregate more than the national debt limit it is my duty to vote to raise the national debt limit to take care of the appropriations that I voted for;

in fact, I would feel that I was not doing just right if I did not.

I voted against it last time because there was plenty of money in 11,000 commercial banks on deposit to the credit of the Government which, if used, would mean we would not need to raise the debt limit. That is the reason I voted against it at that time. Subsequent events have proven that those of us who voted against it were entirely correct in our assumptions and our judgment, because they did have enough money without raising the debt limit.

The tax bill that is coming up soon affects our revenue; and if it affects our revenue, it affects the bill we are passing here today. We cannot carry out these deserving projects unless we have the money to do it. I want to mention just one feature of the tax bill and invite your careful attention and consideration of this one matter which I intend to invite to your attention.

SO-CALLED DOUBLE TAXATION

I merely want to invite your attention to a few things about double taxation, which I doubt has received the consideration of all the Members of the House. First, over a period of years I sought an answer to that question of double taxation on the corporation and the recipient of dividends. It did not seem right to me, and I tried to find an answer. But I could not find an answer and have finally come to the conclusion that we have double taxation throughout our tax system; that we cannot escape double taxation unless we resort to something that is worse, namely, the single-tax system. Therefore, as long as you do not have a single-tax system, you are going to have double taxation in one form or another. I think double taxation on the corporation and the recipients of dividends is less obnoxious and less objectionable than other forms of double taxation. For instance, with reference to corporations, they fix their prices on what they sell so that they will get a good return for their stockholders, a sizable amount for retained earnings and enough to cover their taxes. In other words, the prices are fixed taking into consideration the taxes that they must pay. You know that and I know it too. That is what is always done. Thus, the consumers pay those corporation taxes—they pay them directly in the price of the goods that they buy. If we go ahead and exempt the recipients of dividends of the stockholders, then neither the corporation nor the stockholders will be paying any tax at all. That would not be right. This particular provision in the tax bill is, I know, just the camel's nose under the tent. If it is a good theory, it should be expanded and should take the place entirely of the corporation tax. It is either good or it is bad. If it is good, we ought to work toward the elimination of double taxation. If it is bad, we should not even start it. We should not let the camel's nose get under the tent just a little bit as we are doing in this bill, otherwise it will affect our whole revenue system. For instance, when an individual buys an automobile he pays a Federal excise tax of let us say \$100. He also pays the income tax on

the money which he uses to pay for the car. He has either paid the tax or he is liable to pay the tax, and he will pay it. When he pays the Federal excise tax, he will be paying the taxes twice. That is double taxation. There is no way to escape it. The corporation benefits there more than the individual because if a corporation buys an automobile, it is charged up as a business expense, and the taxes deducted so the corporation is not at the disadvantage that the individual is in such a case.

Just consider the amount of taxes paid last year in the form of excise taxes. It amounted to over \$10 billion. That means that practically all that money, which, of course, is on transportation, tobacco, and admissions to theaters, and purchases of furs and jewelry, and other things, amounted to over \$10 billion last year. Practically all of it—except where the purchases were made by corporations—was paid by individuals and was double taxation. There you had billions and billions of dollars paid by the poorest people in our country. Why should we offer the recipients of dividends, the stockholders of corporations, this exemption and not offer it to the others? There you get into something else. I think the answer is that there is no satisfactory way to grant exact justice to all taxpayers. When I first went to the legislature of the State of Texas we had a tax bill up and one of the members of the committee explained it this way. He said, "I am going to be perfectly frank with you. We have brought in a tax bill to raise a lot of money, and in agreeing on this tax bill we are presenting to you a bill that will do what we would do if we were out on a farm picking a goose. In picking a goose you want to get the most feathers with the fewest squawks." That is exactly the kind of bill we are presenting to this Congress—one that will get the most money for the fewest squawks. That is the way most tax bills are—the most money for the fewest squawks. But there is only one way by which you can eliminate double taxation entirely and that is by the single tax. I do not believe there is one Member of this House who would want to adopt the single tax system. But that is the only way you can eliminate double taxation.

Furthermore, we must recognize there is no way of granting to all taxpayers exact justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. There is no way to grant exact justice to taxpayers. There is just no way to do it. Over the door of the Supreme Court just across the street you will see this motto: "Equal justice under law," written plainly for everybody to see. That is right. That is all our American form of government promises our people, "Equal justice under law." It does not promise "exact justice." Exact justice is absolutely impossible.

Over the years that I have had the privilege of serving in this body, I have known Members who felt that they should have exact justice provided in every bill that came before this body.

Although they would agree with 90 or 95 percent of the bill that was presented, there would be something that they did not like, and they would vote against the entire bill. They were looking for exact justice, and that is something you cannot get. It is the same way in taxation.

A corporation that collects taxes from the people and then pays dividends to its stockholders is benefited in another way. They retain a large part of their earnings, retained earnings, upon which they have paid the tax that the purchasers of the goods paid to them to pay. They have paid that. But these retained earnings go into the corporate funds, and they are used by those corporations for expansion purposes; to put in new establishments, new businesses, and to expand existing businesses. If we continue to do that, I want you to keep in mind there is another thing to be considered. As these concerns get larger and expand more and more, and a unit is put in a little town in your district, the money to put in that unit of the big concern in your little town will come from retained earnings. That is costless capital to the concern that put that unit in. What chance has the little man in that little town in your district who must go to a nearby bank or lending agency and borrow money and pay interest on it—what chance has he got in competition across the street with that concern that has costless capital to use? He would have no chance at all. So whenever you begin to give more benefits and more opportunities for relieving them of more and more taxes, I think it is worthy of our consideration to just stop and think and see where we are going and where it will lead us. Will it lead us to industrial or business monopoly, Government control, a few people owning all the businesses of the country? It certainly will not lead to decentralization. So, in considering this double-taxation elimination, I hope you keep in mind those points. We just cannot possibly have a perfect tax system.

So in considering this tax bill I hope you carefully weigh and carefully consider that part which starts out upon a new theory, a new trend—not only a new trend but a new economic policy by our Congress of getting the camel's nose under the tent to stop what is called double taxation, but which I believe would cause more injustices and inequalities than it would correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS] and the other members of the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Appropriations Committee, for their excellent work in consideration of the many projects covered in H. R. 8367. I am sure all of us realize the enormous task that they had in endeavoring to provide adequate funds for the numerous civil-functions projects coming under their jurisdiction, with the available moneys to cover them.

I call attention to a statement in the committee report, page 8, with reference to the projects of the Pacific northwest

in which the people of my district, as well as in that entire area, are deeply interested:

Funds in the amount of \$29 million have been allocated for the Dalles lock and dam, Oregon and Washington, a reduction of \$5,100,000 in the budget request. This reduction is based in part on unobligated and unexpended balances estimated to be in excess of \$6 million at the end of the present fiscal year. The project, however, is a part of the comprehensive Columbia River Basin program for which \$267,300,000 has been authorized to be appropriated. Actual appropriations through fiscal year 1954 total \$232,991,600. Funds requested in the President's budget were greatly in excess of the remaining authorization of \$34,308,400. Rather than arbitrarily reduce the various projects to be within the authorized amount the committee has limited the funds available for the Dalles project to an amount sufficient to place basinwide appropriations with the present statutory limit.

The committee recommends \$1 million for the lower Columbia River fisheries program, a reduction of \$360,000 in the budget estimates. At the end of fiscal year 1954, \$558,900 of previous appropriations is estimated to be unobligated. This amount, when coupled with the committee allocation will provide sufficient funds for an orderly continuation of this program.

While there is allocated for the McNary lock and dam \$24 million and the Lookout Point River project \$3 million, the Dalles lock and dam \$29 million and the Chief Joseph Dam in Washington \$27 million, we are disappointed in that \$5,100,000 of the requested budget has been eliminated from the Dalles lock and dam projects and some \$11 million, I am advised, from the amount requested to keep this project on schedule.

I was interested to note that the chairman of the subcommittee in his opening remarks stated that it was the belief of the committee that projects of this sort which were under construction should be completed as soon as practicable in order that the Federal Government might receive the revenues from the sale of hydroelectric power which they will produce when the generators are put into action. This is particularly true of the Dalles dam. It is my understanding that the \$5,100,000 eliminated from the budget request as stated in the report, was due to the fact that there was no monetary authorization for it. I have a bill pending in the House, H. R. 8377, which will supply this deficiency and not only covers the \$5 million deficiency but also \$11 million to keep the Dalles project going full speed ahead to finish on schedule. I hope that before the bill reaches the President these items will be restored to the bill in order that the project may be completed on schedule at the earliest possible time so that revenues from power sales will be available to the Government and we will not be threatened with a blackout to meet the demands of hydropower in the area.

I appeared before the subcommittee urging that appropriations be allowed to complete these projects in the Columbia Basin area which are now under construction going forward without delaying their completion by failure to appropriate the necessary funds to keep up with the schedule of construction as recommended by the Army engineers.

My congressional district borders on the Columbia River and these projects now under construction on the Columbia River which provide hydroelectric power for the Pacific Northwest are vitally important to the economy of the whole area in which my district shares very heavily.

The Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects since their completion have proven to be profitable investments for the Government, which are returning revenues to the Government rather than losses as is the case in so many other public works constructed by the Federal Government. The Bonneville project is ahead of schedule on repayment to the Government for all of the cost allocated to power.

Unless construction on the Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph projects is continued according to schedule there will be a heavy dearth of hydropower in the Pacific Northwest needed to keep abreast of the increased demand for power. I urge that the appropriations required for continuing construction of these projects on schedule be allowed in order to forestall the hardships that will result to the area in the event that the power is not made available. As I will point out this will not result in losses to the Federal Treasury but will on the other hand make a profit for the Treasury from the revenues received from power from the completed projects. A year's delay which will result of the slowdown now proposed is adopted would bring about a loss of revenues from power of some \$21 million.

The appropriation in this bill for the Dalles lock and dam project, Oregon and Washington, would result in a slowdown of construction whereby the schedule of installation of power generators will be delayed 1 year, so I am advised. Up to this point the fastest economical schedule in construction has been maintained. In the Northwest the need for additional electric energy remains urgent.

Also, for the Chief Joseph Dam project in Washington, the appropriation requires a delay of 1 year in installation of all generators after the first 4.

It is most important that these projects be placed back on schedule to avoid a brownout in the winter of 1956-57 and following years. If the present schedules should prevail and the Pacific Northwest experiences a dry year when streamflows reach minimum proportions, the shortage of power would probably be even more severe than we experienced in 1952, a dry year for lack of rain.

Under such conditions, the utilities and industries in the region would suffer a heavy financial burden inasmuch as they would require greater reliance on operation of high-cost thermal plants.

Any slowdown in this program would also cause a possible loss in production and employment. The industries in the Northwest which are dependent on power for their production would curtail operations or shut down, thereby causing a loss in output of products as well as wages for employees, with attendant reduction in tax collections by the Government. There is another important point I have considered in determining what course of action would achieve

economies. The delay in these projects will cause the Federal Government to lose over \$21 million from power revenues, as I have said, which could never be recovered. Since a good portion of the total cost of these projects has already been invested, it would be sound business to install all the generators in accordance with the original schedules of the Army engineers in order that these projects may repay the investment of the taxpayers as quickly as possible.

The Bureau recommendations for the cut in the Dalles Dam which reduces the expenditure in the appropriation approximately \$14 million is not in any sense a saving to the Government, but a loss. The loss to the Treasury from power revenues which would otherwise be received from this project if construction continues according to schedule would be \$11 million. In the Chief Joseph Dam the loss to the Federal Government would be approximately \$9 million, and the combined loss for the projects would be, as I have stated above, over \$21 million from revenues alone.

In view of the fact that heavy expenditures have already been made by the Federal Government, good judgment would dictate that the projects should be completed at the earliest possible moment so that these revenues from power can be received into the Treasury and obviate the necessity of having a heavy investment held over for a year in idleness.

For these reasons I can find no economies achieved in a slowdown of these three important projects, and urge that sufficient funds be allotted to properly maintain the construction schedules on the basis of the urgent needs, and hope that before this bill reaches the President these cuts will be restored to the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RILEY], who previously spoke on this particular bill, in that it is certainly a nonpartisan bill. We, on this subcommittee, have worked long hours and many days in trying to perfect a bill which is extensive and in which many projects are considered.

It would be wonderful if we had more money, but the simple facts are we have to work within certain limitations. There are projects that are worthy throughout the entire United States, there are those that I feel personally are more worthy in the country than some that were proposed in the budget; nevertheless, it is a difficult job and certainly one that this subcommittee cannot really do properly to try to differentiate as to those which should be given priority of consideration.

I might say that our subcommittee spent last summer and early fall going through the West and down into California looking at civil-works projects of the Corps of Engineers. Late in the fall we spent some time on the Mississippi River from Memphis to New Orleans trying to familiarize ourselves with the problems of the folks in the

lower Mississippi Valley. All these trips were most enlightening to us, and we found that there are many problems, and we have, I believe, been able to legislate more wisely for having taken the opportunity to go down and take a look at them.

I would like to say just one thing while I am here, and that is that if you will look through this particular bill you will find no project that involves the district of any member of this particular subcommittee. There are those of us who have projects in which we are vitally interested; there are those of us, shall I speak frankly at this time, who are vitally interested in the St. Lawrence Seaway project which will be before the House in a few days, we hope. We trust that those of you who have not taken the time will take the time to study the merits of this particular project. I assure you it is meritorious, as meritorious as many of the navigation projects which we have in this bill today. I think most of them in this bill are meritorious.

We have spent millions and millions of dollars on the Mississippi River, millions of dollars on the Ohio River, millions of dollars on the Monongahela River, and millions of dollars more to be spent on the Warrior and other navigation projects throughout the country. But every one of these particular projects is vital to the economy of the United States. They have done much for our entire economy.

I feel the same way about the St. Lawrence Seaway project, which can be proven to be meritorious in every sense, a project that will not only benefit a particular section of the country but will be of real interest to the entire economy. Certainly the port of New Orleans, the port of Houston, the port of Los Angeles, and the port of Baltimore have a direct and profound effect on Michigan, Wisconsin, or wherever you may live. I hope when the time comes that you will take the opportunity to see the merits of our particular project as some of us who have had the opportunity to study these projects that are before you in this particular bill have given to your particular projects, because we feel they have merit. We only want a project to be considered and sold on merit. A project that is not meritorious has no place before the Congress of the United States.

In closing may I say that I have enjoyed working with every member of this particular subcommittee and, as I said before, there have been no partisan considerations in this particular bill. A project must stand on its own merits or it will fall. We have a wonderful bill here. Of course, it cannot satisfy everyone. We never will present a bill that will satisfy everyone, but we do have a bill here that is as acceptable as one can be and we trust it will receive your favorable support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty-seven

Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Fallon	McCormack
Addonizio	Feighan	Mailliard
Albert	Fernandez	Mason
Allen, Ill.	Fine	Merrill, Ind.
Barden	Fino	Miller, Nebr.
Barrett	Fogarty	Miller, N. Y.
Battle	Forrester	Morano
Becker	Friedel	Morgan
Bentley	Fulton	Morrison
Bentsen	Gamble	Moulder
Blatnik	Garmatz	Multer
Bolling	Granahan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bolton	Green	O'Neill
Frances P.	Gwinn	Osmer
Bosch	Halleck	Patten
Boykin	Hardy	Philbin
Bramblett	Harrison, Nebr.	Powell
Brooks, La.	Hart	Preston
Buckley	Hays, Ohio	Radwan
Busbey	Heller	Reed, Ill.
Byrne, Pa.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Canfield	Hollifield	Roberts
Carnahan	Holtzman	Rodino
Celler	Hosmer	Roosevelt
Chelf	Hruska	Scherer
Chudoff	Javits	Shafer
Church	Jensen	Sheehan
Clardy	Jonas, Ill.	Shelley
Colmer	Jones, N. C.	Sieminski
Cooley	Kearney	Sikes
Corbett	Kelley, Pa.	Simpson, Pa.
Curtis, Mo.	Kelly, N. Y.	Staggers
Curtis, Nebr.	Keogh	Taylor
Davis, Tenn.	Kersten, Wis.	Thompson,
Dawson, Ill.	King, Calif.	Mich.
Dempsey	King, Pa.	Tuck
Dingell	Klein	Velde
Dollinger, N. Y.	Kluczynski	Warburton
Donohue	Krueger	Weichel
Donovan	Lane	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Latham	Yorty
Evins	McConnell	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 8367, and finding itself without a quorum, he directed the roll to be called, when 314 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago we heard some talk from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue about the Ides of March, the implication being that if the unemployment situation had not improved by that time the administration would give some serious thought to launching a program of public improvements.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of this subcommittee on appropriations dealing with the Civil Functions bill to the fact that I did not appear before their committee in behalf of a project in my district. If the administration is going into a program of public improvements in an effort to forestall increased unemployment, there is a project in my district, the Sutton Reservoir project, the contract for which can be let on 30 days' notice; and it could well be, I think, the first project that would go into an undertaking of this kind.

I am just calling the attention of the subcommittee to the fact that we may

later be asking for a special appropriation for some other projects if this program is entered into.

At this time I would ask the chairman of the committee for some information about which I inquired at the committee desk: I inquired as to how much present appropriation there is for the Army engineers to handle small projects involving the expenditure of less than \$150,000; I would like to ascertain a comparison of the figures for fiscal 1955 with fiscal 1954.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We have no new money at all in the 1955 bill for that purpose. But that does not reflect a desire on the part of the committee to discontinue that type of work. It does reflect an unexpended balance of something over \$1,500,000 estimated at the end of the 1953 calendar year. I do not believe that I have the figures that would give the gentleman an estimate as of June 30th or the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. BAILEY. How does that compare, Mr. Chairman, with funds available in the current budget? As I recall there was some money available, an unexpended balance last year of something like \$3 million.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It is estimated that during the current fiscal year the obligations will be about \$1,600,000, which gives you an idea as to the general scope of this program and of the carry-over that is anticipated. The Bureau of the Budget recommended a small amount for that purpose and we have not provided any new funds for it.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman know what obligations are against the current funds in the way of projects under way at the present time?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. No; we would not have that.

Mr. BAILEY. Then there is no way of telling how much funds would be available after July 1 of this year.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. We are not in a position to give that estimate at this time.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman. I may be in a position to offer an amendment at the proper time.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 8367, making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955.

I commend Hon. GLENN R. DAVIS and the other members of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions very highly for their good work over the many years it has been my privilege to observe their study and action in this most difficult field. Civil functions include flood control and navigation matters that affect the economy of our entire Nation and particularly the economy of the areas adjacent to our rivers such as the Mississippi and Missouri Rivers bordering Iowa. In wartime many of these projects were necessarily postponed even though their very postponement was expensive and harmful to the areas needing help. I have been particularly inter-

ested in three items in the field of civil functions throughout the years, namely, the rebuilding of the Keokuk Lock, the protection of farmlands along the Mississippi River by adequate construction of levees and drainage facilities and the Coralville Dam on the Iowa River which flows into the Mississippi River in my district. There are several other flood-control projects in which I have been interested but these three have been the most urgently needed.

All 3 of these projects have been in serious need of attention throughout the past 15 years, but World War II caused a long delay in getting to them and the Korean war caused a further delay that has been exceedingly hazardous. Throughout my many appearances before the Appropriations Committee and my discussions of these projects here on the House floor in years gone by, I have urged action at the earliest possible date because of the seriousness of the threat to the safety of my constituents both because of floods and because of navigation hazards.

This is the first time in many years that the Appropriations Committee has been able to consider these projects without the interruption of war, and the people of the First Iowa District are extremely happy to know that provision has been made for each of these projects in H. R. 8367.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Civil Functions has in this legislation made good on their decisions of bygone years that these projects are meritorious, and I extend them my sincere commendation on their action.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of our subcommittee [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I hope to make my remarks on this bill quite brief. I do want to emphasize for just a moment what the Chairman said in his excellent opening this afternoon, and that is that we have felt definitely obliged—not because we think it is a good rule for all time—to keep within budget estimates on this bill.

It has not always been pleasant to do that. It has resulted, I think, in some inequities in the bill. But this is the first budget of this administration and we have a part of the over-all responsibility to keep within that budget under present circumstances. I would not like it to be understood that as far as I am personally concerned I believe we must always follow the rule of following the budget, either for minimum figures or for maximum figures.

I want to refer to two of these inequities. I am for the committee bill, I intend to support it, I do not intend, of course, to offer any amendments to it. But there are two mistakes which greatly concern me as the result of following this rule which I want to call to the attention of the committee, and to the Bureau of the Budget.

BEACH EROSION

One, dollarwise, is a very small program and a very small amount of money indeed. In the 79th Congress we passed legislation to help local areas with shore

erosion problems, and we did that on the theory, as has been said to me by my colleague from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS], that salt water is just as wet as fresh water, and that when coastal areas of our country are flooded by ocean storms they are entitled to some protection as well as the river and interior areas. There is no territory in this country on any coast, the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, on the Gulf, or on the Great Lakes, that is not affected by this problem.

In following the recommendations of the Budget in this bill—and I support it with some reluctance—we are cutting down that entire problem, and, mind you, I am not talking about construction funds, because we never have except in one instance, recommended construction funds for these projects. We are cutting out the planning money for this very important national problem. We have \$80,000 for general studies of the Federal Government, and \$25,000 for co-operative studies. That is a very inadequate amount; yet, as small as it is, it would not take a great deal of additional funds to implement this present program because this is not, as I have said, a construction program yet. It is a study program. It has done an immense amount of good already by teaching our local areas what to do, because in our Beach Erosion Board we have a collection of experts in this country who know what to do to help one area without harming another area. That money has been well spent and must be increased in the earliest possible moment.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. I commend the gentleman and back up everything he said about the necessity of this study. Only recently the Beach Erosion Board—and when I say “recently,” it is within a week—filed a report of their study of the northern coastline of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Barnegat Inlet, which is about half the coastline. It is an extremely interesting and comprehensive study, and the first one that has ever been made. It was made with the help and cooperation of the State authorities. I am told that the Beach Erosion Board is starting to make a similar study of all shorelines of the United States, including the Great Lakes, and the study is now underway in the district represented by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND], for the southern coastline of New Jersey. It is a shame that we should reduce that budget. It is a small item, and I hope that in the wisdom of the committee an additional \$100,000, which is all that is presently necessary, might be found to supplement the appropriation, and do this work.

Mr. HAND. I appreciate the comments made by the gentleman because, of course, he is one of the pioneers in this problem, and had a great deal to do with the original authorizing legislation passed in the 79th Congress.

I want to emphasize that while the gentleman from New Jersey and I are both deeply concerned because of the nature of our districts, representing, as we

do, the entire coastal area of New Jersey, that this problem is by no means confined to New Jersey. It is found everywhere where there is a developed coast, from the oceans to the Great Lakes of this country. There must be 125 Members concerned with this problem, and I hope that eventually Congress will give some real and adequate attention to it, and that quite soon.

THE DELAWARE RIVER

The second problem to which I would like to make a brief reference is not a problem which is of direct concern to my district, but it is a problem of great concern to the economy of this country. Again, in following our budgetary limitations, we have, I think, temporarily neglected very necessary repairs and improvements to the Delaware River, one of the great ports of this Nation. I would like to read just a very brief extract which is found on page 574 of part II of the hearings, in which a witness from Philadelphia said in part:

Back in 1938 Congress authorized a width of 1,000 feet in Delaware Bay and 800 feet starting in the river up to the naval base at Philadelphia, with a depth of 40 feet for the entire length, and with auxiliary anchorages.

Now, there never has been a time since that authorization in 1938, except for 1 or 2 years during the war, when wartime traffic had to have it, that the authorized depth of 40 feet has been maintained in the Delaware River, and the situation now has gotten into such a deplorable state that you cannot say there is a controlled depth of as much as 35 feet, and the charts will indicate that in many cases the depth is less than 29 feet.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am cognizant of the fact that the gentleman who is addressing the Committee is well informed on the subject on which he speaks. As far as it relates to the Delaware River, he has that intimate knowledge that enables him to speak with a great deal of authority. He understands the importance of the Delaware River. It has become an even greater industrial valley in the last 2 years and is growing at a tremendous rate. Some recognition of that fact, of course, is being given to the lower Delaware, but we are also interested in that portion of the Delaware between Philadelphia and Trenton. Could the gentleman give us some information as to the status of that matter with respect to appropriations that will enable us to utilize the river to the fullest extent for the benefit of the people and of the great industries?

Mr. HAND. I will say to the gentleman I am glad he raised that point. That section of the river has no status before the Committee on Appropriations at this time, but it is pending in immediate plans of the Army engineers, and I take it it will be pending before the Committee on Public Works at this session. Now, that is a very necessary improvement, because that will serve what the gentleman has referred to as the expanding Delaware River Valley, the

"Delaware Valley Empire," and its many plants. There are 8,000 plants now functioning on the Delaware River, 8,000 industrial plants. One is the huge Fairless Steel Works recently constructed in the vicinity of Trenton. So that section of the Delaware is going to be crying for improvement, and justly so.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Of course, it is very regrettable that the importance of that portion of the river has not been recognized by the Congress up until this time. I am encouraged, however, by what the gentleman says, that we may expect some consideration of the subject, probably at this session of Congress.

Mr. HAND. I hope so. I know of the gentleman's great interest. Let me say further that the other section of the river to which I was previously referring has gotten into such serious shape that \$12 million in property damage was done recently as a result of the collisions of vessels trying to scrape their way along that inadequate depth, which is not sufficient for larger vessels. This is an immediate problem. The other problem is also one for present consideration.

The committee has given careful attention to this matter and has been concerned by it. I call your attention to a section of the committee report, page 10, where we say:

The committee is deeply concerned with the status of maintenance in the Delaware River from Philadelphia, Pa., to the sea. This project has been constructed to an authorized 40-foot depth, but lack of maintenance over the past several years has considerably reduced this depth and the effectiveness of the channel. The committee expects the Corps of Engineers to review the tentative allocation—

I stress that because this is not a limit in this appropriation bill. This tentative allocation must be reviewed by the Corps of Engineers—

and allocate such funds as will be required to maintain the project to a degree of effectiveness consistent with the needs of the vessels transiting the channel.

If there is any river in this Nation which requires attention at this time it is the Delaware. I trust that the Corps of Engineers, within the limit of their overall appropriations, will do everything they possibly can to make navigation safe and efficient for this port which, as my friend pointed out a moment ago, has doubled in importance in recent years. It has always been one of the greatest ports in the United States.

There are just 1 or 2 things I should like to add in conclusion. The chairman earlier mentioned that we have a problem for the future, in that we have got to provide proper local contributions to all these projects, local contributions of a more equitable character than are now being afforded to the various flood-control and other projects throughout the country. I suggest to the thinking of the committee at least that we must emphasize navigation projects, and it might not be unwise to require some contribution by way of tolls. I am suggesting the possibility of a study of tolls for these river transits as we now have tolls in the Panama Canal and as it is proposed to have tolls in the St. Lawrence Seaway.

These are just a few random thoughts that I have in mind in connection with the bill. The bill, on the whole, is a very good bill. I expect to support it, although in these two respects it disappoints me bitterly. I trust that the Congress will realize that if I, as a member of the subcommittee, am disappointed, they might be able to swallow some of their disappointments, too, and go along with this year, in the best interests of the national welfare.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin what I have to say by complimenting the subcommittee, as so many of our colleagues have already done, on doing an excellent job under trying conditions. I know it is a difficult job to sit on that subcommittee and parcel out or divide out the limited amount of money which is available under the budget estimates for the vast work carried on under the civil functions appropriations throughout the United States.

I do not disagree with the subcommittee or its able chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Davis], in attempting to follow the recommendations of the budget. I think we must have some limit or program to follow in handling the affairs of civil functions. If we do not follow the budget recommendations we are in grave difficulty to keep within any kind of reasonable limit the expenditures that we are called upon to make in the Congress.

This bill in my judgment ought to be called not the Civil Functions Appropriation Act but the National Development Act. It should be called this because the expenditure of every penny of the money in this bill is intended for the purpose of developing the internal resources of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, as I have sat here and listened to the speakers and those who have addressed inquiries to the members of the subcommittee, I have been impressed by the fact that this bill covers the length and breadth of the whole United States. I checked the list of the projects of the various States of the Union and I find every section of the Union represented by expenditures under the terms of this bill.

The total amount allocated for all purposes is only \$276 million. I have seen the time when in this Congress we appropriated some \$600 million for the joint purposes of flood control and navigation. It is cut down now to \$276 million, which I think is an all-time low in appropriations for this purpose under the President's budget. Of this \$276 million, only \$34 million is placed in the bill for navigation.

I have seen the vast developments in Europe. I made a study of water navigation in Europe. I found how useful this type of development for a country may be. In fact, I have figures in my pocket which I am going to use at some later date showing the developments in different parts of Europe, even since World War II, for navigation purposes. They far outstrip the expenditures which we

are making in the United States in this bill.

So I say this bill is national in character. It is a national development bill. It affects California, Oregon, Massachusetts, New York, and every part and section of the country. Still, it is cut to a very low overall program.

I am not against any of the programs presented here. I think they all have worthy objectives.

I may say there is not a single project in this bill that is located within the district it has been my pleasure to represent in the Congress of the United States. It is true that the Red River bank stabilization may affect parts of my district. We have projects in Louisiana to be built, one of which has already been mentioned, and I think it is extremely important. It certainly ought to be studied now, and in time it should be authorized by this Congress. That is what is called the Old River closure project. It is extremely important.

I was born down in the section of the country where this project is to be located. I know the area where the Atchafalaya and the Red Rivers come together in confluence with the Mississippi River. I know that if the channel of the Mississippi ever chooses to use that of its tributary Atchafalaya as the main channel into the Gulf of Mexico, great cities like New Orleans and Baton Rouge and other cities along the lower Mississippi are going to be left off the main stem. I think a project of this sort is of transcendent importance. I am sure when we get to the point that this project is authorized and is ready to be presented to the subcommittee, the subcommittee will give it the same conscientious effort, thought, and consideration they have given these other projects.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I thank my distinguished colleague from Louisiana for endorsing the Old River control-structure project. I have received encouragement from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], on that project, which is in my district. The committee is going to consider the Old River closure project, also the St. Lawrence Seaway project. I certainly hope the committee will report both bills favorably so that we may have an opportunity to vote for them on the floor of the House. I again thank my distinguished colleague from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank my colleague from Louisiana. He will find that I do not limit my support to projects located within my home district in the State of Louisiana. This is an excellent project, and it should receive the careful and serious attention of the Congress.

There is another project which I have in mind of great importance. It is a project which was approved in 1946. It is the Red River lateral canal. Some people do not realize that the Red River of the South is one of the great streams of the globe. It is 1,200 to 1,300 miles long. It flows from New Mexico all

the way through Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana to its confluence with the Mississippi at Old River and the Atchafalaya at Angola. This project would lateralize for canal purposes the Red River from the city of Shreveport to the mouth of the Red River at Angola. This is the project which has already been approved by the engineers. It is a project which is thoroughly feasible and economically justified by figures which were sent up at that time and approved. Those figures have been verified since then. It is a project, likewise, that should receive careful study and thoughtful consideration and proper action on the part of the subcommittee. I commend it to the consideration of the subcommittee in handling the work of the civil-functions appropriation bill. I hope construction will soon start on this worthy project.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am supporting each and every item of this bill. I am supporting them because it is a bill of national character, with projects all over the United States. I am a vice president in the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. We are interested in development throughout the United States. I myself would have liked to see the amount expended for these purposes larger, but I am not critical of the subcommittee. The subcommittee followed the Bureau of the Budget to a large extent, and they have brought to the House a bill which, of course, I am going to vote for.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, addressing oneself to an item in this bill is somewhat like making a speech to a judge to reverse his decision when his decision is against you and is already in his desk drawer. Actually, however, I do think there is some occasion for the Congress to consider very carefully the way we have been handling these problems. When I say that, I must first pay the highest compliment to the members of the subcommittee. I have the highest regard for them. I know they perform each year a most unpleasant task. Sometimes the courage of the committee is not conducive to a great deal of comfort, since hundreds of witnesses are heard each year, and after all is said and done, we come out with the budget figures as they were to start with. Now, like most who have addressed ourselves to this problem, I, too, have a problem that is covered, or should be, as I see it, by the terms of this bill. In 1936 the Congress of the United States passed a large flood-control project for the Yazoo Basin in my State. The Congress put that program through and it became law. It provided for the building of several large dams and reservoirs, but in order to have a well-rounded project, included in it, too, was the straightening out of streams below those reservoirs, and certain related work, so that those in the area affected could live with it. Beginning a few years later, Congress appropriated funds, and, prior to my coming here, two big dams were built with the result of flooding thousands of acres of fertile land in my district.

When I came here I went before the Appropriations Subcommittee in an effort to prevent the construction of the other two dams and reservoirs in this area because of their local effect. At that time I was told that all of this was 1 project; that since the Government completed the 2 dams the committee could not justify the elimination of the other 2 dams which were such a vital part of the 1 overall project including the related works I now support. So they have constructed the other two major dams and the Government has flooded additional thousands of acres within this area.

Then, when I went to the Corps of Engineers for these related works, which are so vital to the overall project, and so vital to the people of that area, at first they told me, "You will have to wait until we have completed the dams." Now that they have completed the dams their statement is that we have to wait for these related projects until they open up the outlet to these streams.

In this bill the Corps of Engineers has not provided any detail concerning any substantial work toward opening up those outlets which have to come first, before they will do the related projects in the area, according to their statements, so that the people there can live with what the Government has already done.

In connection with starting out any overall project which the Congress approves and authorizes because it is an overall project, it must have some definite fairness in it. We need some way to see that the funds appropriated are used to carry forward the related parts of this program at the same time as the major items, else we will find ourselves in the fix that I am here. Funds are made available in this bill for the lower Mississippi. Funds are made available for flood-control projects, but the related, relative minor works, that are so vital to my people and a part of the overall project, leave us where we are apparently being held behind the completion of major works in other areas.

As I am told, the Budget Bureau has not frozen these funds to the point that we could not get relief in my area from the engineers, but the direction and the decision as to where the funds are to be used is left to the Corps of Engineers and the president of the Mississippi River Commission. We expect to do everything we can to get the Corps of Engineers to review and revise the allocation of funds so as to treat our area with some degree of fairness. But I would like to say, if we are to have a limited amount of money each and every year, and we know we always will, if within the limits of the money that we find we can appropriate for the lower Mississippi or any other part of this country, you are to leave it up to the Corps of Engineers as to where the limited funds go you will always find that they want to build the big structures. Who wants to dig a ditch when you can build something big of concrete and steel and write your name on it? I say it is a mistake when the discretion is left to the Corps of Engineers as to where to use, what many of us

think is too small an amount of money to start with, because they will always use the money to get the big structures started somewhere else, rather than carry out the responsibility which the Government has to build the relatively minor parts to complete a project that they have already started.

Now this is not a criticism of this subcommittee. It is a criticism of the system whereby we in the Congress virtually turn over to the Budget Bureau, first, the public works program, and if they do not say you can have it, it is all out. Then if the Budget Bureau says you can have it, then leave up to the Corps of Engineers the determination of what to do with such funds as are appropriated, because always they will be building, primarily the big project they can put your name on, which will stand there for years to come, even though that major project half completed in my area might have carried with it related smaller projects about which there is no great acclaim and no place to write one's name.

I hope to address myself to the Congress tomorrow under the 5-minute rule. My plans are not to offer an amendment, but I do think the Congress and the Government is committed, having forced the construction of four major dams and reservoirs for our area, to proceed to the completion of this project so we can live with it. I hope we can convince the Corps of Engineers as to the wisdom of doing that and of their responsibility about it. I understand that is in line with the law as it stands, although it is not contemplated by the Corps of Engineers at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the upper Kentucky River Valley, a region of rugged hills surrounding fertile valleys, was among the earliest developments in the State. Daniel Boone traversed this valley to establish the first permanent settlement of Boonesboro on the Kentucky River.

The agricultural development in the area had denuded the slopes of a great part of their forests with the result that the flood stage was substantially raised. These floods became not only a hazard to the agricultural valleys but a serious menace to the industrial centers of the coal development in that the increase of the flood stage seriously damaged these trade and industrial centers. In 1938 the Congress authorized a comprehensive flood-control plan including the Buckhorn Reservoir and the Jackson Cutoff. Before actual construction could begin on any of these authorized projects, war interfered. All efforts were bent toward strengthening our national economy for a wartime effort. The demand for coal continued high and the region suffered from periodic spring floods followed by fall droughts creating conditions that discouraged the development of new industries that would normally thrive in an area that produced millions of tons of coal each year.

The inevitable result is that a one-industry economy has developed, subject to the usual cycles of one-industry communities. During the past 2 years, the coal business has suffered severely and at the current time almost one-third of the industrial workers in the region are unemployed. The fact that the known coal reserves are more than adequate for 200 years at the current rate of production, gives good reason to believe that this condition is temporary but that does not lessen the current problems. At this time, the upper Kentucky River Valley does not produce enough to sustain the population of the area. This constitutes an economic drain upon the country as a whole and the waste of manpower resulting from the unemployment is a national loss that can never be recovered.

The 1955 budget for the civil functions of the Department of the Army includes planning funds for the Buckhorn Reservoir and the Jackson Cutoff. These two projects, essential for flood control in the Kentucky and Ohio River Valleys, can now be constructed by using the unemployed labor of the area which otherwise will be a total economic loss to the country. It will not only give these industrious workers a chance to earn their own living but also relieve them and their families of untold suffering. The conditions in this valley have long since passed the recession stage and constitute a major depression approaching that of the early thirties with thousands of families actually starving. The Surplus Commodity Corporation is distributing some of the agricultural surplus food in the area, but this is both inadequate and unsatisfactory even though it may prevent death or serious illness among the unemployed. These people only ask for a chance to work for their own living. The only immediate opportunity for this is the construction of these much needed flood-control projects.

It is very important that our Army engineers be given the necessary funds to complete the plans at the earliest possible date so that construction can begin during this local recession, at which time the cost will not be a drain on the national economy but an actual saving of our national resources.

The same holds true for the construction of the proposed navigation dam in the vicinity of Greenup, Ky. The construction of this dam is very much interwoven with the canalization of the Big Sandy River because it is a matter of common knowledge that we need better harbor facilities.

The completion of this project would provide a wider, deeper, and more stable pool which would be a decided benefit to navigation interests, and harbor and terminal facilities. A considerable reduction in lockage and travel time would result from the replacement of 4 structures with 1. Harbor facilities along the Big Sandy River would be considerably improved for several miles above the mouth by raising the pool elevation.

The construction of this dam would also reduce the flowage damage chargeable to the Big Sandy River project; as

a result, reduce the cost of the canalization of the Big Sandy by making the Big Sandy navigable several miles upstream. In other words, lands which would be flooded out would have to be acquired under the cost of construction of this project instead of being chargeable to acquisition costs under the Big Sandy River project.

Building the dam will make the Big Sandy River navigable for commercial navigation approximately 12 to 15 miles above Catlettsburg going up the Big Sandy, or approximately one-half the distance between Catlettsburg and Louisa, Ky.

This dam will increase the marketability of our eastern Kentucky coal by making available suitable sites for the construction of unloading facilities to transfer the coal from rail cars to barges up the Big Sandy as far as the site of old lock No. 2. At the present time there are no facilities on the Kentucky side for unloading coal from rail to barges. On the West Virginia side we do have such facilities at Kenova, W. Va. The West Virginia coal now has an advantage on account of the switching charge that would be added to the price of Kentucky coal.

The construction of this dam would provide a most feasible spot for unloading on the Big Sandy between locks Nos. 1 and 2. These unloading facilities would undoubtedly be installed forthwith and would enable our eastern Kentucky coal to reach the industrial markets along the Ohio River.

The canalization of the Big Sandy is the complete answer to markets for Big Sandy coal. The construction of this dam in the meantime will be of great assistance to our whole area. This will make available many places where new industries interested in using a river can advantageously locate.

On the 29th of November 1949, in Huntington, W. Va., I spoke in behalf of the proposed navigation dam in the vicinity of Greenup, Ky. I think my concluding statement at that time is applicable today:

I am very happy to make this statement in behalf of the Greenup Dam. It seems to me that the construction of this dam, in order to have a great industrial region in this area, is indispensable from that standpoint. It also occurs to me that with the construction of this dam in a few years to come that towns on the Ohio will grow tremendously because of the steel plants and other plants that will be recommended by the Defense in Washington to be constructed in areas of this type, that the surrounding areas for hundreds of miles will benefit from the construction of this proposed dam. It seems to me that it will furnish employment for many men with the improvement of the harbor facilities and the growth of industry in this region. It seems to me that employment will increase tremendously in this area. For those reasons, and it is natural with the prospective construction of the Big Sandy Valley canalization project, that we need better harbor facilities in this area, and for those reasons I have appeared here this morning at the request of Dr. Thompson to put in my appearance in behalf of this proposed project. I think it is a step forward and the people in this area should get behind it and assist the Army engineers in every way possible to get it constructed at the earliest possible date. I thank you.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. WHEELER].

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, there is not anyone in the Congress who has been and is more interested in seeing to it that all subversives and security risks be removed from Federal employment than I. I have been impressed in recent weeks with stories that I have seen in the press, heard on the radio, seen and heard by way of television, wherein various astronomical numbers have been used as to the number of so-called security risks that have been fired from Federal service.

I have been caused to wonder seriously as to just how these large numbers were arrived at until last Saturday morning when a colored man by the name of Ezekiel Johnson, residing here in the District of Columbia, formerly residing in my district, being from Waycross, Ga., came to my office and told me this story.

He said in effect that in September last he was accused of having engaged in the so-called bug racket here in the District of Columbia. Engaging in the "bug" racket is defined by statute as being a crime. Johnson was taken to the United States District Court where he was duly tried and acquitted of the charges filed. He thought he had been given a clean bill of health.

To his utter consternation, dismay, and surprise, shortly afterward he was haled before a so-called Security Hearing Board which had been established within the General Services Administration and was peremptorily dismissed from the Federal service as a security risk.

This led me to the conclusion that perhaps many more of these so-called security risks about which the press, radio, and television commentators have talked in recent weeks, were determined to be security risks on just such specious ground as having been accused—mind you, he was not convicted—he was accused and exonerated by the United States District Court, of some such crime as was Johnson.

I would like to say this, knowing something of the propensities of this man's particular race, that if this number of 2,200 or 2,400 is to be increased on some such basis as this—in other words, if the Federal employees in the District of Columbia are to be fired from the Federal service for having been accused of playing the "bug," then the complexion of Federal employees in the District of Columbia is about to undergo a very rapid bleaching process.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Will you explain what this "bug" is?

Mr. WHEELER. It is synonymous with shooting craps. It is gambling by lottery.

Mr. DORN of New York. Did the gentleman talk to anyone else besides the man who came to his office about this?

Mr. WHEELER. I have a certified record of the hearing, signed by all three members of this security board.

Mr. DORN of New York. And the only charge is what?

Mr. WHEELER. They say in their memorandum of the hearing that they are not constrained to pay any attention whatsoever to the fact that this man has been exonerated in the United States district court.

Mr. DORN of New York. Was there any other charge besides this?

Mr. WHEELER. No other charge.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. Is it not true that Vice President Nixon on Sunday night almost exonerated all of those who had been separated from the Government rolls? Did the gentleman hear the Vice President's remarks on that?

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman may place his own interpretation on the effort of the Vice President.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. AYRES. Does the gentleman think that the man in question, being a colored man, is subject to any particular discrimination?

Mr. WHEELER. I asked him if he had been to the NAACP. He said he had, but he was advised that since no discrimination was involved he was beyond the vale of their help.

Mr. AYRES. I have a colored gentleman who may be faced with similar circumstances, and if his case proves to be the same as the gentleman's, I would be glad to work with the gentleman from Georgia on this matter.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not attempting to justify this man's participation in the so-called bug racket; I am attempting to say he was charged with having violated the law and was exonerated, then on the basis of that charge and that charge alone was labeled a security risk.

The thing that impressed me about this Negro man's story was this: He said, in effect, to me: "If they had fired me for having played the 'bug' I would not have complained, but they have placed the label on my record which causes my friends and neighbors and my prospective employers to think I am a Communist. I have had 15 years of service in the Federal Government, 3 years of which was in the military service in World War II. I am not a Communist, nobody has accused me of being a Communist, but they have labeled me with this all-inclusive term security risk and my neighbors and friends think I am a Communist."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I am mystified and intrigued by the term "bug racket." Is that a social game?

Mr. WHEELER. It is sometimes referred to as the numbers game. Perhaps that is where the gentleman, Mr. Stevenson, in Miami about a week ago last Saturday, got this nomenclature, "numbers racket."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be well to consider the fact that developments on the rivers of the Northwest and the rest of the Nation are not a regional but a national concern, for their benefits in lower cost and more plentiful production of food, aluminum, and manufactured items are benefits to the whole Nation.

Therefore the threatened delay in completion of the Dalles Dam is of importance to all of us, so to all the Members of this House I say that this wasteful, needless delay is wrong and should not be allowed. I have opposed in committee, and must oppose here, in the strongest terms I know, this unbusinesslike, unnecessary dragging out of the work at The Dalles.

There are only three large sources of quick new power on the Columbia River, the greatest untapped power source in the country. The sources are the new Federal dams now in progress at The Dalles, McNary, and Chief Joseph. Other sources, however good they may be, are not quick sources. They will take time to develop. That is why I deplore the false economy represented in an appropriation throwing completion of The Dalles off schedule by a full year.

We have an urgent need for power in the Pacific Northwest. In the winter of 1952-53, low water in the Columbia River reduced the power output to a point where brownout restrictions were necessary, generating equipment was run at overload capacity, power for aluminum production had to be interrupted or else replaced with expensive steam generation, and I am told that power companies rejected applications from any potential new industries for power in excess of 500,000 kilowatts.

I have been told that the Bonneville Power Administration estimates that the growth of the Northwest by 1958 will require 4 million kilowatts of new power. If this pace of growth continues, I feel sure that the 1,092,000 kilowatts from the Dalles Dam will be needed as soon as we can get it.

The project at The Dalles is underway. The money to be spent must be spent sooner or later. To delay the project a year does not save money. It costs money. It costs money in extra carrying charges on the investment in the dam. It costs more money and the waste of a resource to let the water of the river run past a partly completed dam for a need-less year, without taking from the water the power that is there. The sooner the dam begins to operate, the sooner its cost will be repaid.

A job that has been started is a job that should be finished. It is unbusinesslike, simply for the sake of a delay—not an economy, a delay—in the invest-

ing of \$16 million to sacrifice a year's time at the Dalles Dam.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DORN].

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the Committee on including the 25 percent increment for the workers in the Canal Zone in the bill under consideration. I notice, however, on page 13 of the report of the committee, a criticism leveled at the report by Booz, Allen & Hamilton, management consultants. They made an extensive survey of conditions in the Canal Zone and their conclusions are the same as those I arrived at as a result of a recent visit to the Panama Canal. As you know, I am a member of the subcommittee on the Canal Zone of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and I felt it my duty as a member of that committee to investigate the living conditions, the cost of living, and the manner of life of the residents of the Canal Zone who work for the United States Government. I found that they do not have equal housing conditions with their fellow workers in the United States, that the conditions under which they live are much below the conditions of similar workers in the United States, and that the climate cannot be compared to the climate in any part of the United States.

The children of the workers do not have the same advantages as do similar children in the United States. When they grow up, they are unable to find suitable employment in the Canal Zone. They must be separated from their fathers and mothers and return to the United States. The employees themselves cannot own their own homes because there are no homes for sale in the Canal Zone, the workers not being permitted to purchase land.

When the employees are retired, they must leave the home that they have known practically all of their lives and to which they have become accustomed because the United States will no longer rent an apartment to them.

I do not believe the committee should have taken a small extract from the report of the management consultants. The overall contents of the report amply sustains the findings that the Canal Zone workers are entitled to a 25-percent increment, and I wish to make the positive statement that as a result of my investigation, I found they are definitely entitled to the 25-percent increment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chairman, I am an enthusiast for navigation facilities. More than a half century ago we started in an attempt to dam and lock the Ohio River. Around 30 years ago we finished the last one of these navigation facilities. Since that time the Ohio River has increased its potential so far as tonnage is concerned as much as 10 to 12 times. Some of these dams are 50 years old. Many of them are becoming obsolescent. Many of them have gotten to the point where it is almost impossible to give complete navigation facilities, and much delay is caused because of this fact.

There are now being planned, as some Members know, some high level dams. We have one on the Ohio River which is near Gallipolis, Ohio, which has displaced about 3 or 4 of the dams mentioned above. There is another one planned at Greenup, Ky., which would likewise displace about four of the above dams.

The cost of operation of these large roller-type dams is comparatively small when we take into consideration the total cost of the number of dams that are eliminated by reason of the replacement with the larger dams.

It seems to me that good judgment in the allocation of funds for rivers and harbors improvements, particularly for these inland waterways, would be to devote more funds toward the improvement of the already existing facilities rather than to try to find new areas in which to spend money.

Ohio River navigation is an established fact. It is a paying thing. All up and down the Ohio River we have been able by reason of water transportation facilities to locate very splendid industrial facilities of one sort or another. They are going to have to depend largely upon water navigation. If we are going to protect these installations which we have been occasionally referring to as installations in the modern American Ruhr, then we must not forget the fact that these existing facilities must be taken care of.

I appreciate the effort that has been made by this committee in using the funds as best they saw fit, and I think, too, they have done a good job. But I do feel we should not neglect navigable streams that already exist, that have been built up to the point where they are already a going concern, and which should be furnished money with which to maintain their facilities.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's district, as he knows, runs along the Ohio River for probably 100 miles.

Mr. NEAL. Two hundred miles, almost.

Mr. JENKINS. And mine runs about 175 miles. He and I both have seen the growth of navigation on the river. There is no question but what the growth of navigation from Parkersburg to Cincinnati has increased far more than 10 times. The traffic is terrific. The need for these facilities, especially at Greenup Dam, is imperative.

Mr. NEAL. It is imperative.

Mr. JENKINS. We just have to have it.

Mr. NEAL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. I concur with my colleague from West Virginia in his remarks on the need for this improvement at the Greenup facility and the Ohio River below Huntington. It is a great waterway and it will be immensely useful to the coal industry of West Virginia in pro-

viding cheaper transportation. I think it should be included in a future budget.

Mr. NEAL. The gentleman has made an excellent statement.

One of the things that interferes with present-day traffic on the Ohio River is the fact that these dams are not only obsolete, but even on as large a stream as the Ohio River, one that usually has enough constant flow to keep up a good pool, by reason of the fact that we do not have anything in excess of these dams that are being put out of condition occasionally may require flooding from one dam to the other in order to permit navigation. These are the things on which we need the expenditure of some of our money. I hope the time will come when we can curtail some of our foreign expenditures and devote that money to our own American waterways that need it so much.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my appreciation to the committee for the money placed in this appropriation bill for the continuation of the work on the flood wall at Vincennes. I wish to report that the work on this flood wall is progressing in an excellent manner. While there is considerable work yet to be done after this appropriation is exhausted, the work will have progressed far enough that we would be able in a few years to realize security from floods at Vincennes.

I wish that every member of Congress could understand the importance of this project, and know the gratitude of the people of Vincennes for this most worthwhile project. I trust that this body will accept the recommendation of the Committee and permit this project to go forward.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a comment by the gentleman from West Virginia prompted me to take this time to discuss a project we have in Stockton, the Stockton Deep Water Channel. The harbor was finished in 1933 so it is 20 years old now. Many millions of tons of military and civilian freight have passed up and down that river between our city and San Francisco Bay.

When the turning basin was made in 1932 it provided for the type of vessel of that day. Since that time the vessels plying up and down that river have increased almost 200 feet in length, and they have a lot deeper draft than they had before. I have taken up with the Budget Bureau the enlargement of that turning basin to fit the present-day vessels.

Mr. Hughes has listened to me very courteously. I have furnished him the data which shows the necessity for the enlargement of the turning basin. We are putting up \$600,000 of our own money to help pay for this cost. We have the necessary land, or options on it, required for the enlargement of the turning basin and for spoils areas. I

am hoping that Mr. Hughes or the Budget Bureau will authorize the project as one of the new starts we have heard so much about.

I know this committee could not consider this project because it was not in the budget recommendations, but perhaps over in the other body they will give serious consideration to the enlargement of the turning basin of the Stockton Deep Water Channel. It is my opinion that the data I furnished shows conclusively, and they were furnished me by the port director of that port, that we must have a larger turning basin, which will take good care of the new type of vessels, some of which are 500 feet long and over, that are plying up and down that river. This is a service that the shippers and ship operators are entitled to.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Chairman, once again I wish to urge that the House approve the request for appropriations for projects in the Twenty-fifth District of California, as contained in the bill we are now discussing.

In order that lives and property in my area may be protected, it is most important that work continue on San Antonio Dam, and Whittier Narrows Dam. In addition, funds should be appropriated to initiate construction of flood-control projects in Eaton Wash, Arcadia Wash, and Sawpit Canyon Wash. The forest fires in southern California earlier this year have created a flood hazard greater than has existed previously. Already large amounts of mud and debris have been washed down from the foothills into the Duarte area, and also in Monrovia which is in the neighboring district represented by our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HESTAND].

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point my letter to the Secretary of the Army of December 23, 1953, and also my statement before the Subcommittee on Civil Functions of the Committee on Appropriations.

HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As the time is approaching for submission to the Congress of the President's budget for the fiscal year 1955, I wish to direct your attention once again to the urgent flood-control needs of the 25th Congressional District. Since the Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for flood-control projects, I am directing this communication to you with the request that the following facts be considered when funds are requested by that agency.

As you know, there are a number of projects which vitally affect the welfare of the people of this district. In my home area, Arcadia, we are intensely interested in alleviation of the flood hazard in the El Monte Avenue area. It is my understanding that this project is connected with the improvement of channels for Arcadia, Eaton, and Rio Hondo washes. I urge that these projects be given highest priority.

In the eastern section of the 25th district, I am deeply concerned with the need for sufficient funds to continue work on San Antonio Dam. The tremendous growth of population in the Pomona Valley area has increased the potential hazards in the event of a flood such as occurred in 1938.

Funds will be needed also for the completion of the Whittier Narrows Dam which has been under construction several years.

The expansion and development of industrial facilities in the 25th district which are

participating in the national defense program have brought in thousands of families and caused the construction of a vast number of new homes. Many of the industrial plants and houses would be imperiled if there should be another flood disaster. The protection of lives and defense facilities, therefore, makes these flood-control projects well justified.

You may rest assured that I shall be happy to cooperate with you toward the completion of these projects which are so important to our rapidly expanding area in southern California.

Most sincerely,

PATRICK J. HILLINGS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. HILLINGS. I am pleased to be here with my colleagues and I concur with the statements of Mr. Griffith and Colonel Hedger, both of whom have performed an outstanding service in my opinion to the State of California and to Los Angeles County.

I have always received the finest cooperation from these two gentlemen and their colleagues serving the needs of the people of my district.

I regret that I was unable to see the committee, Mr. Chairman, when it visited southern California. By having been on the scene you have a good picture of our problem there.

As Mr. HESTAND has already said, the lives of the people in the foothill areas, 500,000, have been placed in jeopardy by the recent rains and floods. The fires in the mountains burned away some of the protection which we normally might have had.

My district, as shown on the relief map, is under the two dark patches here which indicate the forest fires. We are interested in the protection that we would have from further construction and completion of the San Antonio Dam, the Whittier Narrows Dam, and of course, the washes that are outlined on the map, such as Eaton Wash, Arcadia Wash, Sawpit Canyon Wash, and so forth. Particular attention should be directed to flood hazards in the Duarte area.

I would appreciate very much the serious consideration of the committee of these problems. I would like to say again that I concur in the statements previously presented.

I would like to insert a resolution of the City Council of the City of Arcadia, Calif.

I thank you gentlemen.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. HILLINGS. We will be glad to accommodate you.

(The resolution referred to follows:)

"Resolution 2324

"Resolution of the City Council of the City of Arcadia, Calif., urging prompt action to alleviate flood hazards

"The city council of the city of Arcadia does find and resolve as follows:

"SECTION 1. That the city of Arcadia has long been plagued with floodwaters arising above and beyond the confines of the city of Arcadia. That the city of Arcadia has for many years led all cities and communities in this area in the amount of new residential construction, with the result that the city is almost entirely developed to single-family residential use. That such development has necessarily decreased the amount of natural percolation of rainfall and has greatly increased the runoff of surface waters within the city of Arcadia. That the surrounding areas have likewise experienced a phenomenal development, which has added to the conditions creating flood problems and hazards. That the city of Arcadia has neither the jurisdiction nor the means by itself adequately to remedy the situation.

"SEC. 2. That the people of the entire County of Los Angeles have recognized the urgency of the flood conditions prevailing in this county, have appreciated the inability of cities and communities to solve these problems on a purely local basis, have plainly in-

dedicated the desire of the overwhelming majority to remedy the conditions wherever they exist by voting a \$179 million bond issue for flood-control purposes, and that work has already commenced to carry out the purposes of such bond issue.

"SEC. 3. That in some locations and particularly in the city of Arcadia, the effectiveness of the county flood-control program is largely dependent upon and at times must await completion of flood-control projects by the United States Army Corps of Engineers. That the Arcadia Wash in the city of Arcadia and the Eaton Wash adjacent to the city are and for some seasons have been the cause of alarm to all the residents of the community and of considerable damage and loss to many persons in our area. That the immediate completion of the Federal projects concerning the Arcadia Wash and the Eaton Wash is of utmost concern to the city of Arcadia and its inhabitants, and is of absolute necessity and must be completed before other correlated flood-control projects in this city can either be completed or become effective.

"SEC. 4. That the city manager be and he is hereby instructed to send copies of the within resolution to Vice President-Elect RICHARD NIXON, Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL, Congressman HILLINGS, Los Angeles County Flood Control District, and the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, urging prompt action by all in power to expedite Federal flood-control projects concerning the Arcadia Wash and Eaton Wash, and requesting the integration of related county programs therewith, to the end that the ever-increasing hazard of flood damage to life and property may promptly be reduced to a minimum.

"SEC. 5. The city clerk shall certify to the adoption of this resolution."

"I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Arcadia held on the 6th day of January 1953, by the affirmative vote of at least three councilmen, to wit:

"Ayes: Councilmen Dow, Hulse, Kennett, Nottingham, and Schmocker.

"Noes: None.

"Absent: None.

"W. M. CORNISH,

City Clerk of the City of Arcadia.

"Signed and approved this 6th day of January 1953.

"JOHN A. SCHMOCKER,

Attest:

"W. M. CORNISH, City Clerk."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read down to and including line 7 on page 1.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MCGREGOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8367) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their

remarks in connection with general debate on the bill H. R. 8367.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, having introduced the original authorization for additional flood protection for Beardstown, Ill., I wish to publicly thank the Civil Functions Subcommittee members and Chairman DAVIS for its inclusion in the appropriation bill before the House of Representatives today. I want the full House Appropriations Committee and Chairman TABER to know of my personal appreciation.

The protection is needed and justified or I would not have introduced the authorization resolution.

The subcommittee, the full committee, and the House of Representatives will never regret the included amount of \$400,000 for the prosecution of work on the flood project at Beardstown, which is so badly in need of repairs and strengthening.

This Illinois city of 6,000 people, with its complement of churches, schools, factories, stores, and railroad shops, I am sure, join with me today in even more appreciation than I can transmit.

THE DANGERS OF JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, events in recent years have focused public attention on the threat of communism, fascism, and other foreign political philosophies which constantly seek to undermine, overthrow, and destroy the constitutional freedoms of our people. This is as it should be; in recognizing these evils and in taking the necessary steps to eradicate them from our society, we are merely acknowledging the truth of the old axiom which says that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

Because of conditions as they exist in the world today, the perilous international situation that prevails, with the clouds of another global war hanging ominously overhead, it is only natural that our thoughts and activities should be directed toward preparation for war and the preservation of American institutions against the constant, real, and deadly challenge of Russian communism and its evil menace, both external and internal. Nor is it less important or natural that we should be giving serious thought to our domestic economic condition, which finds us owing more than all of the nations of the world combined, and with taxes taking about a third of our income for the operation of our Federal, State, and local governments.

With all these problems confronting us, their dangers to freedom and liberty conceded, the average American citizen would probably construe the greatest threat to liberty and our form of government to be that presented by commu-

nism. But, without meaning to minimize communism as a very real and serious threat to our form of government, or to individual liberty, I would point to another which I believe to be even greater. That is the purpose of my taking the time of the House this afternoon.

Because communism is foreign, and is in direct opposition to the basic fundamentals of America's system, it finds itself when properly exposed, without support or sympathy among the great masses of the American people. It is held up to the public, and properly so, as the enemy of freedom and a challenge against our institutions. The same becomes true with respect to any other foreign inspired philosophies when their real nature becomes apparent to our people.

Unfortunately, other equally insidious and lethal assaults on our form of government are not so easily detected, nor are they so readily apparent to the masses of our citizenry. Articles I, II, and III of the Constitution provide that our Federal Government shall be composed of three separate and distinct branches, each to be independent of the others, with each to discharge certain duties and to have such powers as are specifically delegated to them by the Constitution. The checks and balances so exercised by each of the three branches in relationship to the others were designed to insure that one would never be permitted to infringe upon the rights and duties and prerogatives of the others. Further, another limitation upon the powers of the Federal Government—including all three branches—was imposed by the 10th amendment, which positively and affirmatively denied to the Federal Government the exercise of any power not specifically delegated to it under the Constitution, such powers being reserved to the States or the people. The language of that amendment is clear, precise, and easily understandable. In order that I might not be misunderstood in what I say here, or that I be accused of using certain portions of that amendment out of context, I am including herewith the complete text of that amendment:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Therefore, in order to provide a maximum of individual freedom to our citizens, the framers of the Constitution set up a sort of double checks and balances system: The checks of each branch of the Federal Government against the abuse or usurpation of power by the others; and the reservation to the States of such powers as are not specifically delegated to the Federal Government.

It is in the complicated check and balance system, the division of governmental authority and prerogatives and powers between the Federal Government and the several States individually, which has prevented the tyranny of any one over the other. It is this system which has made impossible the concentration of powers in the hands of a few which leads inevitably to an oligarchy, makes impossible any semblance of government by will of the people.

This then is the real strength of our form of Government, enabling it to endure throughout the years as the first, and now—the oldest—representative form of government in the world. It is because our Founding Fathers believed that government derives its just powers by consent of the governed, and proceeded to write that belief into our basic law in unmistakable language and in no uncertain terms, that the great citadel of freedom which is America has been able to attain its present position as leader of the free world.

What shall we gain in America, if we repel the alien forces which seek to destroy us from without, and yet permit our Constitution to be destroyed from within, so that we shall indeed have lost the very thing we have striven so long to preserve?

At the risk of being labeled a rabble rouser, or a demagogue, or a reactionary or what-have-you, I am going to say that our constitutional processes are under real and immediate danger of being destroyed—not by some predatory enemy from without or by foreign agents from within; but rather, at the hands of the highest Court in the land, whose sworn duty it is to guard zealously those processes.

In recent years, since an ambitious Chief Executive sought to change, and did change, in effect, the status of the Court from its constitutional nature as a separate and independent entity of our Government to that of a mere arm of the executive branch, that great tribunal has lost much of its former prestige. Certainly it is not looked upon with the same great respect, an almost reverent regard, which it enjoyed and deserved in former years. Nor has the present occupant of the White House added stature to that sagging body through the appointment of a political friend whose greatest claim to judicial or professional qualifications for such appointment is to be found in the fact that his personal influence conceivably might have meant the difference between victory and defeat for his party in his home State.

When we reach the place where we can no longer expect or depend upon our courts to interpret the law as the law is, but must predicate our activities on the presumption that the Court may rule according to what it thinks the law should be and without regard for what it is, then we shall have no such thing as law. You may say that such will never be the case; that our people will never permit that to come about; that such fears are entirely groundless. My friends, I wish it were not true, unfortunately, the Court must already answer to history for some of its recent decisions.

If you were a judge, and you should be asked to base your decision in any case on premises alien to the law, or to disregard the law in rendering your opinion, should not you consider such to be an insult? Certainly, I would consider it an insult, perhaps of such gravity and brazenness as to be in contempt of court. Yet, listen to what was argued in a recent case before the Court, the case of Henderson against Southern Railroad:

What we seek is not justice under the law as it is. What we seek is justice to which the law, in its making, should conform.

Mr. Speaker, that quotation was taken from the brief filed by the Justice Department of our Government, presenting itself as a "friend of the Court." Actually, it was presenting itself as a political spokesman for the administration of President Truman, then in power, to argue a case in which the United States Government could have had no interest whatsoever, other than to serve the political needs of the administration.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that plea of the Attorney General and the Justice Department was the most brazen insult to the intelligence and integrity of the Court that had ever been directed against it. Where is the authority of the Supreme Court to interpret the law—not on the basis of what it is, or what it was intended to be—but rather, to draw from the law what is not in it, and make it conform to what they think

should be in it? Obviously, for the Court to follow such a course is for it to assume the powers of legislation, specifically given to the Congress and it alone, by the Constitution.

Did the Court resent this kind of phony argument and promptly repudiate it by decree? Obviously, it was a confession by the Justice Department that the law was on the other side and did not support their position. On the contrary, the Court overruled every precedent and completely overturned existing law to find in favor of the complainants—the side espoused by a politically minded Attorney General and his Justice Department. In doing so, the Court wrote new law; it legislated by judicial decree that which Congress had refused to enact.

Nor was that the first time in recent years that this body has overreached its

authority to upset existing law in order to construe or remake it as they thought it should have been. The distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Davis], listed in a speech in this House on June 18, 1953, 32 such decisions rendered between 1937 and 1953, each of which overruled a case previously decided by the Court, construing the Constitution and established principles of law accepted and relied upon by both the courts and the public for long periods of years. At this point I will insert this list showing the names and citations of the overruling case, the year in which it was overruled, the vote by which it was overruled, the name and citation of the overruled case, the year in which that case was decided, the vote by which it was decided, and the age of the overruled case at the time it was overruled:

Overruling case	Term	Vote	Overruled case	Term	Vote	Age (years)
1. <i>Helvering v. Producers Corp.</i> (303 U. S. 376).....	1937	5 to 2.....	<i>Gillespie v. Oklahoma</i> (257 U. S. 501).....	1921	6 to 3.....	16
2. <i>Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins</i> (304 U. S. 64).....	1937	8 to 0.....	<i>Burnet v. Coronado Oil & Gas Co.</i> (285 U. S. 393).....	1931	5 to 4.....	6
3. <i>Graves v. N. Y. ex rel. O'Keefe</i> (306 U. S. 466).....	1938	7 to 2.....	<i>Swift v. Tyson</i> (16 Pet. 1).....	1842	Unanimous.....	95
4. <i>O'Malley v. Woodrugh</i> (307 U. S. 277).....	1938	7 to 1.....	<i>Collector v. Day</i> (11 Wall. 113).....	1870	8 to 1.....	68
5. <i>Madden v. Kentucky</i> (309 U. S. 83).....	1939	7 to 2.....	<i>N. Y. ex rel. Rogers v. Graves</i> (299 U. S. 401).....	1936	8 to 0.....	2
6. <i>Helvering v. Hallock</i> (309 U. S. 106).....	1939	do.....	<i>Miles v. Graham</i> (298 U. S. 501).....	1924	8 to 1.....	14
7. <i>Tigner v. Texas</i> (310 U. S. 141).....	1939	8 to 1.....	<i>Colgate v. Harney</i> (296 U. S. 404).....	1935	6 to 3.....	4
8. <i>United States v. Darby</i> (312 U. S. 100).....	1940	Unanimous.....	<i>Helvering v. St. Louis Trust Co.</i> (296 U. S. 39).....	1935	5 to 4.....	4
9. <i>United States v. Chicago, M. St. P. & R. Co.</i> (312 U. S. 392).....	1940	do.....	<i>Becker v. St. Louis Trust Co.</i> (296 U. S. 48).....	1935	do.....	4
10. <i>Nye v. United States</i> (313 U. S. 33).....	1940	6 to 3.....	<i>Connolly v. Union Sewer Pipe Co.</i> (184 U. S. 540).....	1901	7 to 1.....	38
11. <i>California v. Thompson</i> (313 U. S. 109).....	1940	Unanimous.....	<i>Hammer v. Dagenhart</i> (247 U. S. 251).....	1917	5 to 4.....	23
12. <i>Olson v. Nebraska</i> (313 U. S. 236).....	1940	do.....	<i>Carter v. Carter Coal Co.</i> (298 U. S. 238; limited).....	1935	do.....	5
13. <i>Alabama v. King & Boozer</i> (314 U. S. 1).....	1941	8 to 0.....	<i>United States v. Lynch</i> (188 U. S. 445; overruled in part).....	1902	5 to 3.....	38
14. <i>State Tax Comm'n v. Aldrich</i> (316 U. S. 174).....	1941	7 to 2.....	<i>Toledo Newspaper Co. v. United States</i> (247 U. S. 402).....	1917	5 to 2.....	23
15. <i>Williams v. North Carolina</i> (317 U. S. 287).....	1942	do.....	<i>Di Santo v. Pennsylvania</i> (273 U. S. 34).....	1926	6 to 3.....	16
16. <i>Brady v. Roosevelt S. S. Co.</i> (317 U. S. 575).....	1942	Unanimous.....	<i>Ribnik v. McBridge</i> (277 U. S. 350).....	1927	do.....	13
17. <i>Jones v. Opelika</i> (319 U. S. 103).....	1942	5 to 4.....	<i>Panhandle Oil Co. v. Knox</i> (277 U. S. 218).....	1927	5 to 4.....	14
18. <i>Oklahoma Tax Comm'n v. U. S.</i> (319 U. S. 598).....	1942	do.....	<i>Graves v. Texas Co.</i> (298 U. S. 393).....	1935	6 to 2.....	6
19. <i>Board of Education v. Barnett</i> (319 U. S. 624).....	1942	6 to 3.....	<i>First National Bank v. Maine</i> (284 U. S. 312).....	1931	6 to 3.....	10
20. <i>Federal Power Comm'n v. Hope Gas Co.</i> (320 U. S. 591).....	1943	5 to 3.....	<i>Haddock v. Haddock</i> (201 U. S. 562).....	1905	5 to 4.....	37
21. <i>Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Co.</i> (320 U. S. 661).....	1943	5 to 4.....	<i>Fleet Corp. v. Lustgarten</i> (280 U. S. 320).....	1929	Unanimous.....	13
22. <i>Mahlich v. Southern S. S. Co.</i> (321 U. S. 96).....	1943	7 to 2.....	<i>Jones v. Opelika</i> (316 U. S. 584; reversed on reargument).....	1941	5 to 4.....	1
23. <i>Smith v. Allwright</i> (321 U. S. 649).....	1943	8 to 1.....	<i>Childers v. Beaver</i> (270 U. S. 555).....	1925	Unanimous.....	17
24. <i>United States v. Underwriter's Assn</i> (322 U. S. 533).....	1943	4 to 3.....	<i>Minersville School Dist. v. Gobities</i> (310 U. S. 586).....	1939	8 to 1.....	3
25. <i>Girouard v. United States</i> (328 U. S. 61).....	1945	5 to 3.....	<i>United Railways v. West</i> (280 U. S. 234; overruled in part).....	1929	6 to 3.....	14
26. <i>Angel v. Bullington</i> (330 U. S. 183).....	1946	6 to 3.....	<i>Leeds & Cullin Co. v. Victor Talking Machine Co. (No. 2)</i> (213 U. S. 325; limited).....	1908	Unanimous.....	35
27. <i>Sherrer v. Sherrer</i> (334 U. S. 343).....	1947	7 to 2.....	<i>Plamals v. Pinar Del Rio</i> (277 U. S. 151; overruled in part).....	1927	do.....	16
28. <i>Lincoln Union v. Northwestern Co.</i> (335 U. S. 525).....	1948	Unanimous.....	<i>Groey v. Townsend</i> (295 U. S. 45).....	1934	do.....	9
29. <i>Commissioner v. Church</i> (335 U. S. 632).....	1948	6 to 3.....	<i>Paul v. Virginia</i> (8 Wall. 168; overruled in part).....	1868	do.....	75
30. <i>Oklahoma Tax Commission v. Texas Co.</i> (335 U. S.).....	1948	Unanimous.....	<i>United States v. Schwimmer</i> (279 U. S. 644).....	1928	6 to 3.....	17
31. <i>United States v. Rabinowitz</i> (359 U. S. 56, 66, 85).....	1949	5 to 3.....	<i>United States v. Macintosh</i> (283 U. S. 605).....	1930	5 to 4.....	15
32. <i>Joseph Burstyn, Inc., v. Wilson</i> (354 U. S. 495, 502).....	1951	Unanimous.....	<i>United States v. Bland</i> (283 U. S. 636).....	1930	5 to 4.....	15
			<i>Lupton's Sons Co. v. Automobile Club</i> (225 U. S. 489; rendered obsolete by prior change in law).....	1911	Unanimous.....	35
			<i>Andrews v. Andrews</i> (188 U. S. 14; overruled in part).....	1902	5 to 3.....	45
			<i>Adair v. United States</i> (208 U. S. 161).....	1907	6 to 2.....	41
			<i>Coppage v. Kansas</i> (236 U. S. 1).....	1914	6 to 3.....	34
			<i>May v. Heiner</i> (281 U. S. 238).....	1929	Unanimous.....	19
			<i>Choctaw & Gulf R. Co. v. Harrison</i> (235 U. S. 292).....	1914	do.....	34
			<i>Indian Oil Co. v. Oklahoma</i> (240 U. S. 522).....	1915	do.....	33
			<i>Howard v. Gipsy Oil Co.</i> (247 U. S. 503).....	1917	do.....	31
			<i>Large Oil Co. v. Howard</i> (248 U. S. 549).....	1918	do.....	30
			<i>Oklahoma v. Barnsdall Corp.</i> (296 U. S. 521).....	1935	do.....	13
			<i>Trupiano v. United States</i> (1948) (334 U. S. 669).....	1947	5 to 4.....	2
			<i>Mutual Film Corp. v. Ohio Industrial Comm'n</i> (1915) (236 U. S. 230).....	1914	Unanimous.....	36

Within a few days, or weeks at most, the Supreme Court will render a decision in several other cases in which it has been asked by the administration now in power to upset precedent and to establish, by judicial fiat, new principles of law never approved by Congress or the people. These are the highly publicized cases involving the right of the several States to maintain separate, but equal, school facilities for their children. I refer to the case of Davis against County School Board of Prince Edward County, Virginia, and companion cases.

In these cases the Attorney General has attacked the separate, but equal, doctrine as being in violation of the 14th amendment to the Constitution, despite

the fact that it has been upheld consistently by the courts since the War Between the States.

For 50 years at least, minority pressure groups and other leftwing elements have constantly petitioned Congress to legislate their wishes into being without regard for the rights of the several States. They have been persistent in their demands, even to the point, on occasion, of threatening or bringing about the defeat of conscientious Members of Congress who insisted on placing the Nation's welfare above that of these groups.

Having failed in their efforts to compel Congress to surrender to their demands, they have turned in desperation

to the other branches of our Government, in the hope that the President or the courts would be willing to bypass Congress and enact these laws by judicial decree or Executive fiat. Thus far, they have succeeded to a marked degree. Can it be that our Supreme Court will permit itself to become a vehicle to be used by minorities in their desire to control the majority? Can it be that the Supreme Court will let itself become the means by which legislation rejected by Congress may be forced on the people notwithstanding?

I am not so much concerned over the immediate effects of an adverse court ruling in these school cases as I am over the effect such decisions may have on

the future structure of our Government. Having sworn to protect and defend the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic, and regarding that oath as inviolable, I feel compelled to protest, as vigorously as I know how, what I consider to be open attempts to destroy the meaning of that Constitution.

Until recently, no one questioned the constitutional validity of State laws which provided for separation of the races: This had long since been decided by the Court. Nor do we in the South, where these laws maintain, intend that our separate school systems shall become integrated school systems regardless of what the Court might rule. We can handle that problem when and if it becomes necessary, and we will maintain separate schools, even if it means the elimination of public schools in favor of a private segregated-school system. In event of such a contingency, could the Court honestly say that it is serving the best interests of the Negroes by an antisegregation ruling, when it means that they shall have lost that which they already have?

Throughout the South, legislatures are striving diligently to provide equal school facilities for Negroes and are succeeding at a rapid pace. This is being done in spite of the fact that Negroes, who constitute a large percentage of the population of those States, nevertheless, pay an infinitesimal proportion of the taxes that go to the support of the schools.

Who is being made the victim of unfair discrimination through segregation if facilities and opportunities are equal? The Supreme Court, in the case of *Gong Lum et al. v. Rice et al.* (275 U. S. 78), in a full bench decision, held that no unfair discrimination existed "when equal facilities for education are afforded both classes." This opinion was written by Chief Justice Taft, an Ohio Republican, who refused to permit himself to be influenced in the discharge of his judicial duties by the pressures of political expediency. Listen to this, quoted from the Court's decision in that case, rendered in 1927:

The right and power of the State to regulate the method of providing for the education of its youth at public expense is clear.

Plessy v. Ferguson (163 U. S. 537), decided in 1896, is perhaps the controlling case establishing the validity of the separate-but-equal doctrine. In this case, the Court, in upholding the validity under the 14th amendment of a Louisiana statute requiring the separation of the white and colored races, speaking of permitted racial separation, said:

The most common instance of this is connected with the establishment of separate schools for white and colored children, which has been held to be a valid exercise of the legislative power even by courts of States where the political rights of the colored race have been longest and most earnestly enforced.

Can the law be stated more simply or clearly? Certainly not. In the case of *Gong Lum et al. against Rice et al.*,

which I mentioned a moment ago, the Court, referring to the validity of State separate school systems, said:

Were this a new question, it would call for very full argument and consideration, but we think it is the same question which has been many times decided to be within the constitutional power of the State legislature to settle without intervention of the Federal courts under the Federal Constitution.

In support of their opinion, they cited the following host of previous opinions of the Court:

Roberts v. City of Boston (5 Cush. (Mass.) 198, 206, 208, 209); *State ex rel. Gaines v. McCann* (21 Oh. St. 198, 210); *People ex rel. King v. Gallagher* (93 N. Y. 438); *People ex rel. Cisco v. School Board* (161 N. Y. 598); *Ward v. Flood* (48 Cal. 36); *Wysinger v. Crookshank* (82 Cal. 588, 590); *Reynolds v. Board of Education* (66 Kans. 672); *McMillan v. School Committee* (107 N. C. 609); *Cory v. Carter* (48 Ind. 327); *Lehew v. Brummell* (103 Mo. 546); *Dameron v. Bayless* (14 Ariz. 180); *State ex rel. Stoutmeyer v. Duffy* (7 Nev. 342, 348, 355); *Bertonneau v. Board* (3 Woods 177, s. c. 3 Fed. Cases, 294, Case No. 1,361); *United States v. Buntin* (10 Fed. 730, 735); *Wong Him v. Callahan* (119 Fed. 381).

In the case of *Cummings v. Richmond County Board of Education* (175 U. S. 528)—another case in point—Mr. Justice Harlan, in delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

We may add that while all admit that the benefits and burdens of public taxation must be shared by citizens without discrimination against any class on account of their race, the education of the people in schools maintained by State taxation is a matter belonging to the respective States, and any interference on the part of Federal authority with the management of such schools cannot be justified except in the case of a clear and unmistakable disregard of rights secured by the supreme law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, should the Supreme Court invalidate the separate but equal doctrine in favor of forcing an integrated school system upon the States, it would have to disregard entirely and completely the doctrine of stare decisis. It would have to create new law by judicial decree, and thus bypass the intent of Congress and the letter of the Constitution of the United States.

We, who are citizens of States in which separation of the races is maintained by law, bitterly resent the implication that such separation is an unfair discrimination. In the State of Mississippi, for instance, where 49 percent of the population is colored, there is no agitation among either race for abolishing the separate school system. On the contrary, our negroes realize that the southern white man is their friend, and is helping them to promote the interests of their own people. They realize that segregation does not necessarily make for second-class citizenship; rather, it provides an opportunity for both races to promote their own welfare with help from the other race. Abolish segregation, and you pit Negro and white against each other; you rekindle the flames of racial hatred which have long since been extinguished in our part of the country. Abolish segregation, and I predict that you will see a rebirth of the Ku Klux Klan.

Take the word of the greatest Negro, perhaps, of all times, Booker T. Washington, who said:

In all things which are purely social, we can be as separate as the fingers, yet one as the hand in all things essential to mutual progress.

To the Democrats who claim to be disciples of Thomas Jefferson, an abolitionist himself—he said, in speaking of the slave problem:

Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than these people—

Meaning the Negroes—

are to be free; or is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government.

Perhaps Jefferson went further along those lines than we should go today. But he did reflect the thinking of the writers of our Constitution, who recognized the incontrovertible fact that a mongrel America cannot live in peace; nor can a mongrel America hold the respect of the world.

The great founder of the present day Republican Party, Abraham Lincoln, the man to whom Republicans refer as the Great Emancipator, whom they claim as the political patron saint of the American Negro, debating the slave issue with Douglas at Springfield, Ill., on June 26, 1857, said:

A separation of the races is the only perfect preventive of amalgamation; but as an immediate separation is impossible, then the next best thing is to keep them apart where they are not already together.

Segregation has obtained in this country for so long a time that it has become an established tradition or institution. It has been approved, not only by the people who established it, but by the courts and the Congress. Suddenly, the highest tribunal in the land is called upon to sweep away the bulwark existing in our social and political orbit. They are being asked to deny to our people the fundamental constitutional right of a continuation of this established, approved, and successful practice.

America has grown great and all powerful under our time-honored social and political system. There is a reason for this: The people have an inherent right to shape their own respective destinies. The architects of our dual system of constitutional government purposefully retained in the people themselves through their duly elected representatives the right to legislate laws, repeal laws, and inaugurate policies for the general welfare of all the people. Nowhere can that right and authority be found except in the legislative—and not the judicial—branch of our Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have lived in the South all my life, and have been raised among Negroes. I know how to get along with them, as do my neighbors. We are their friends, and they are our friends. I feel that any step which is taken to abolish the separate school system in our States, and to destroy the independent school system which we have set up for our Negroes, will do the cause of the Negro more harm than they suffered as a result of Reconstruction. But,

as I said earlier, we do not fear the immediate effects of such an adverse court ruling; we are fully capable of handling that problem. However, in the interest of America's future, in the determination that our tripartite form of government with its checks and balances may be preserved for posterity; in the interest of preserving the constitutional rights of the States to order and control their own affairs, it is to be vigorously hoped that the Supreme Court, in deciding the public-school cases now before it, will disregard the pressures of political expediency, and confine itself to ruling on the law as the law is written.

If they follow that course, we have nothing to fear.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi. As he has so well pointed out, whenever the laws of this land are to be changed, that is a function which falls exclusively to the legislative branch and not to the judicial branch.

I have watched with great concern the increasing encroachment of the judicial branch upon the legislative branch of our Government within recent years. And as the gentleman has so clearly pointed out in his remarks, whenever one department of our Government usurps the functions of another department of our Government, that means a serious breakdown of the principles upon which we have established our Government; to provide liberty and freedom to the individual and the preservation of individual rights through our system of State governments in this Republic.

The gentleman has rendered a great service by pointing out these things to the Congress and to the Nation. I have on different occasions taken the floor here to point out the same things, and I want to commend the gentleman on the service which he has rendered by making these remarks today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Georgia. In my opinion, he is one of our great Americans.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman on his contribution to Americanism. I should like to point out, also, that this administration which has advocated States' rights so much, has ordered the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Charles Wilson, to issue a directive to abolish the segregated school system on 21 bases in 7 Southern States. This, in direct conflict with the Constitution, or State laws, of those 7 States.

I immediately called Secretary Wilson and I was referred to Secretary Hanna. I was then referred to an assistant and I requested, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, for them to point out one instance, since they were charged with the defense of this country, wherein that had added one thing to the defense of America.

I further asked the question if it was strictly a political pressure move from the White House, such as we encountered under President Harry Truman's administration. I was requested to give them a day or two to make a reply. I was called over the telephone.

The only answer I have had to this date was that it came from the White House. Even though President Eisenhower himself stated that he would not use the military for a reform of this country until the civilian population went through with this question of segregation, apparently their own leadership, although they say they are not recommending the civil rights program as did the Truman administration, are moving in leaps and bounds along that line; and while America sleeps, believing he meant what he said, I am fearful what the consequences may be.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman has spoken the truth. I think it is obvious that both major political parties have surrendered completely to the demands of the minority groups. Our only hope for salvation lies in the Supreme Court; and if the Supreme Court refuses to discharge its sworn duty under the Constitution, to uphold and defend that Constitution, then I think that our Government is doomed.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WHEELER. I asked the gentleman to yield in order that I might associate myself as being in complete agreement with the lucid and forceful argument just made, or in the process of being made. I should like to say further that the argument that is being presented to the House currently by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] will, by generations yet unborn, be used as a classic in the study of constitutional processes; that is, unless some Supreme Court later were to decide that this sort of treatise should be banned from the public schools—as they have banned even the reading of the Holy Writ.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I am flattered by the gentleman's remarks; I am most grateful.

INDOCHINA: DO WE KNOW WHAT GOES ON THERE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country do not want another Korea; they do not want another war. At this time, however, they are concerned about our policies which may lead to another war without the formal declaration of one.

The President must be conscious of this apprehension, for on last Wednesday at his press conference he said:

There is going to be no involvement of America in war unless it is a result of the constitutional process that is placed upon Congress to declare it.

Of course he was talking about the formality of the constitutional requirement that Congress must declare war. The important question, however, is not related to this formal act but policies that lead to a state of war prior to a request for a declaration of war. The record is clear that in the past Presidential requests have always followed prior acts of war under international law. This was true in World War I and true in World War II.

Our people are asking the question about possible involvement in view of action heretofore taken in Indochina where we have increased our aid for military assistance and where we have recently assigned military planes and personnel. If we are not at war in Indochina, we are dangerously close to it, declaration or not. This raises the question as to when we are at war.

One authority on international law says that war may be fairly described as a condition of armed hostility between states and that it may exist prior to the use of force. In Indochina we have not yet reached that state. It does not follow that the absence of force means we are not at war.

Mr. Speaker, there are different types of war. A general war is one in which opposing states regard the whole domain of the other as hostile territory, and thus prosecute the war against any or all of that domain on a general basis. A limited war, on the other hand, does not require a declaration of war in general terms, and may be conducted on any scale which the belligerent states may choose. Between 1793 and 1800, for example, the United States conducted a limited war against France. American vessels being authorized by Congress to resist searches by French vessels, to capture armed French vessels found anywhere on the high seas, and in other ways to counter the depredations committed by the French against American ocean commerce during the war between France and Britain. No authority was given to capture unarmed French vessels or to conduct land operations.

Just as there are different types of war, so are there different ways in which, according to international law, a state of war may be initiated—first, by the commission of hostile acts by one country directed against another with the design of making war upon it; second, by any unequivocal act on the part of the government of a state, indicating that it regards the conduct of another, whether or not deemed by the latter to produce such an effect, as having brought into being a condition of war; third, by noncompliance with an ultimatum containing a declaration or clear warning that war will ensue in the event of failure of the respondent state to yield to demands made upon it within a specified time; and, fourth, by declaration of war.

Regarding this last method of initiating a war, the Constitution of the United States vests the power of declaring war in Congress exclusively. But in the past this power has been exercised only to the extent of declaring the existence of a state of war, usually after relations with the hostile nations have reached a stage at which such congress-

sional declaration was inevitable; and in every case the declaration has been in response to a request by the President.

In actual fact, the powers of the President in this matter are considerable. Although the Congress is empowered by the Constitution to declare war and provide for the support of the Armed Forces, the powers of the President, as commander in chief and as chief executive, have long been recognized as a dominant influence in bringing about declarations of war and in directing the Armed Forces in time of war. Moreover, these formal powers of the President have been supplemented heavily by congressional delegations of power during periods of national emergency. The declaration by Congress in 1846, for example, that "by the act of the Republic of Mexico, a state of war exists between that Government and the United States," came after President Polk had sent American troops into territory over which the two governments were negotiating and within which American troops were fired upon by Mexican forces. The beginning of the Spanish-American War likewise was precipitated by Presidential actions, the battleship *Maine* being ordered to Havana harbor by the President during a period of crisis in the relations between Spain and the United States.

According to Professor Corwin:

Our 4 great wars—all great for their results, 3 of them great for the effort they required of the country—were the outcome of Presidential policies in the making of which Congress played a distinctly secondary role. I mean, of course, the war with Mexico, the Civil War, and our participation in World War I and World War II.

To this might be added the hostilities in Korea, which the United States entered on order of the President. The support of this action by subsequent congressional enactments might possibly be construed as endorsement, but the decision to commit United States military forces was made by the President.

Once the United States has become involved in a struggle with a foreign power the emergency powers exercised by the President have been extremely broad. In most cases special powers delegated to the President by Congress have been the basis of these extraordinary Presidential actions, but apparently specific congressional action is not always necessary. In December 1950, for example, the President himself proclaimed the existence of a national emergency, and subsequently used this proclamation as the basis for exercising emergency powers. Other notable examples of emergency powers being assumed by the President occurred during the administrations of Presidents Lincoln, Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. In every case the powers exercised were far reaching.

Many of the armed conflicts in which the United States has participated, however, have been treated as virtually routine actions carried out merely under the authority of the President as Commander in Chief. United States marines, for example, have landed on foreign soil on some 285 occasions, a great many of which were not in connection with a declared war. They first landed in Korea

in 1871 on a punitive expedition. Altogether the United States has participated in more than 100 undeclared wars, including the better known cases of: The seizure of Veracruz in 1914, General Pershing's expedition into Mexico in 1916, the naval war with France in 1798, the conflict with Tripoli from 1801 to 1805, and, of course, the recent Korean conflict. These examples illustrate the extent to which the President has been able to conduct wars without first obtaining a declaration of war from Congress.

Today we are confronted with a new type of situation. We are in what generally has come to be regarded as a cold war. According to international law one might say that this is a general war made up of a series of undeclared limited wars. We recognize the Soviet Union as our real enemy; the ultimate objective of the Soviet Union is believed to be the subjugation of the United States. The difference between the present situation and previous states of war is a common recognition that total war involving direct assault with all available weapons likely would destroy both nations. The war in Korea was conducted according to ground rules tacitly accepted by both sides: The United Nations did not bomb the home bases of Red China and the Soviet Union, or even the staging area of Manchuria, and the Communists refrained from attacking our shipping with submarines and our bases in Japan and Okinawa with aircraft. War was never declared by the United States, but great quantities of American military equipment and fighting personnel were committed to the conflict.

This condition, however, is not limited to Korea. Since the end of World War II the United States has committed itself to the defense of virtually the entire free world against Communist aggression. We have security agreements with more than 2 dozen foreign nations, and have other commitments which might arise under the United Nations Charter. Warlike actions almost anywhere in the world are practically certain to involve the United States.

Out of this condition it is natural that there should arise a question of whether we are at war. According to international law, we are at war; we are in a condition of armed hostility with another nation. But according to the American Constitution, we are not at war because Congress has not declared the existence of a state of war.

This question is of particular importance with respect to conditions in Indochina. Supposedly, the war which has been going on there for several years is one between the French and Vietnamese, on the one hand, and the Communist rebels, on the other. In actual fact, it is much more than that. It is clear that these Communist rebels have been trained and equipped by Red China and the Soviet Union, and in an effort to prevent the spread of Communist aggression the United States has contributed to the French and Vietnamese effort. In this connection, a Senate committee recently reported that—

Since 1950 the United States has borne approximately 40 percent of the cost of the

war and at the present time is carrying approximately 63 percent of the total cost.

It is not merely an academic question. The fact that present conditions do not precisely fit conventional definitions does not alter these conditions. Conventional definitions do not necessarily apply in a time of ideological war. What is important is that we should know precisely what we are doing. We do not want to be inched into an untenable position; we do not want to become involved in a war which we might avoid by assessing our actions in terms of their logical implications and the ends toward which we are striving. These considerations, and not particular definitions of war, should govern our conduct in world affairs. Understand this and we shall better understand the crisis now confronting us in the prosecution of the cold war.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, in a few days this body will be asked to pass on the most important tax bill to come before Congress in more than 20 years.

That legislation is known as the tax-revision bill.

It should more properly be labeled as the most brazen attempt by certain business interests, aided and abetted by the Eisenhower administration, to rewrite the entire tax code for their own special privilege and benefit.

This legislation is an open attempt to switch the burden of taxation from the investor to the wage earner—from the corporations and large stockholders to the persons of the lower income-tax brackets.

It is an attempt to make the man who earns his daily bread from the sweat of his brow to pay more and more of the \$50 billion cost of the cold war with Russia, more and more of our \$5 billion in foreign-aid spending, more and more of the \$2 billion cost of our atomic-energy program, while at the same time letting the investor, the corporation president, and the large stockholder pay less and less.

True, there are a few sweet pills placed strategically in this bill to help working widows, parents who can afford to send their children to college, and so forth, but these pills are mere windowdressing which the administration felt necessary to sell such a shocking piece of special-interest legislation.

Now, I do not plan to analyze the specific provisions of this bill at this time. That will come later.

However, I do plan to raise a very important question which all Members of this body should consider in connection with this piece of legislation.

The question is a very simple one.

It deals with the author of the dividend tax-credit section of this legislation and how he will personally benefit from this section.

I am sure that not a handful of the Members of this body knows that the author, Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey, never sold a dime of his hundreds

of thousands of dollars worth of stock as other Cabinet members were forced to do before taking office.

Secretary Humphrey never sold his stock because a private law firm, the same firm that represented corporations which he formerly headed, gave him an opinion stating that he was under no legal obligation to sell such stock. I repeat the words "no legal obligation." It is of great interest to note also that Secretary Humphrey has made it clear that in his opinion he has a right to receive in addition to his regular annual Government salary of \$22,500 dividend payments from his stock.

Now, it is true that Mr. Humphrey, as required by law, resigned all offices and directorship in the corporations with which he was previously connected.

Although it should be noted here that Mr. Humphrey is on leave of absence without pay as an employee of Industrial Rayon Corp. which permits him to retain certain group insurance; also as a former employee of M. A. Hanna Co., his retirement rights continue.

But that is not the issue or the question.

The important question and the issue is Mr. Humphrey's stockholdings, and whether his authorship of the provision which sets up credits for taxpayers who receive dividends is in conflict.

The dividend provision as originally drafted by Mr. Humphrey was designed to eliminate over a period of years all taxes on dividends. However, the proposal was so shocking and so raw that it was toned down by Republican members of the House Ways and Means Committee. But the amended section is still in the bill, and it extends to holders of stocks a special privilege which is not enjoyed by wage earners.

Now, there may or may not be a legal conflict in Mr. Humphrey's stockholdings and his authorship of the dividend provision which will indirectly benefit him. But there is certainly and definitely a moral conflict, and I would say, a deep moral conflict.

Anyone can see the wisdom of the requirement made by Congress to have Defense Secretary Wilson sell his stock. The plain intent of that action was that no man having the custody of the national funds should be in a position to enrich himself by the use of them directly or indirectly; no man shall take advantage of that high office, either for himself or for his friends, directly or indirectly.

It will be of interest to this body that on January 19, 1953, Secretary Humphrey, when testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, promised to furnish that committee a list of his holdings. Also to furnish a list of his family holdings. He made that promise under oath in answer to questions asked by Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma.

Here is the official exchange as contained in the transcript of that hearing. I read:

Senator KERR. I came in a little late, Mr. Humphrey. Did you furnish the committee with a list of your holdings in the various companies with which you have been associated?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I did not, but I will be glad to do so if you would care to have me; I will file it with you.

Senator MILLIKIN. He didn't furnish us a list, but he was asked the question of the largest percentage of stock that he holds in any company in which he is interested. I think he said some 5 percent. He said also in his testimony that he would not attempt because of his stock ownership or relationship with those businesses in the past to influence their policy or attempt to direct them in any way whatsoever.

Secretary HUMPHREY. That is my direct holdings. There are some family holdings in addition to that, but that is my direct holdings.

The CHAIRMAN. If you added your family holdings?

Secretary HUMPHREY. It would be less than 10.

Senator KERR. Did I understand you to say you would be glad to furnish the committee such a list?

Secretary HUMPHREY. I will.

But now let us take a look to see whether Mr. Humphrey has fulfilled his promise.

I took the liberty of having a friend of mine call at the committee's office a few days ago and ask the clerk if such a list had ever been filed by the Secretary. Her answer was, and I quote, "No. I guess he forgot about it."

In the past 48 hours a published story stated that a list of the Secretary's stockholdings was furnished. If that is the case, why was the list never made public or given to our committee? The entire holdings of Defense Secretary Wilson, and other members of the Cabinet, were made public.

How much stock does Mr. Humphrey hold?

How much in the way of dividends did he receive during his first year in office?

How much will he benefit from this dividend provision which he has authored? This year? Next year? The third year?

These are questions that Mr. Humphrey should answer.

It is only known that according to Secretary Humphrey's own testimony he has retained ownership in stock of four companies with whose management he was previously associated. These companies according to Humphrey's own admission are: M. A. Hanna Co., Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., National Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.

These companies, according to Humphrey's own testimony, own interests in a number of other companies.

Again I quote him:

I have accumulated these interests over the period of my connections with these companies, which in the case of M. A. Hanna Co., goes back almost 35 years. The M. A. Hanna Co., in turn owns substantial stock interests in National Steel Corp.; Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal Co.; Industrial Rayon Corp.; Standard Oil Company of New Jersey; Phelps Dodge Corp.; Seaboard Oil Co.; Iron Ore Company of Canada; Durez Plastics & Chemicals, Inc.; Hanna Coal & Ore Corp., and smaller interests in a few other companies.

I am advised by counsel that there is no legal reason why I should not continue to hold the securities which I now own.

According to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 62 of the bound, permanent

edition, pages 3013 and 3014, on February 24, 1922, Senator Watson, of Georgia, made, along with some other comments, the following remarks:

Now, Mr. President, I have called attention to section 243 of the revised statutes, a statute adopted at the first session of the 1st Congress, which organized the Treasury Department and which provides: "no person appointed to the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, the first Comptroller, the first Auditor, or Treasurer, or Register, shall, directly or indirectly, be concerned or interested in carrying on the business of trade or commerce, or be owner, in whole or in part, of any sea vessel, or purchasing by himself, or another in trust for him, any public lands or other public property, or be concerned in the purchase or disposal of any public securities of any State or of the United States." * * *

Anyone can see the wisdom of that law. The plain intent of it is that no man having the custody of the national funds shall be in a position to enrich himself by the use of them, directly or indirectly; no man shall take advantage of that high office, either for himself or his friends; neither, directly or indirectly, shall he deal in United States bonds or interstate commerce or foreign commerce. He shall not even own a vessel. The man who framed that law was wise as any who sat in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the Secretary of the Treasury owes it to Congress to make a clear statement of his holdings and to answer the questions which I have raised today.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can the gentleman give us any idea as to the extent of Secretary Humphrey's holdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. His own testimony in that respect shows that he was the owner of stock in many companies. I have them listed in my remarks. I am sorry to say that it does not show the value of those holdings.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. The reason I ask is that I recall when I first came to Washington some 20 years ago there was a resolution of impeachment against a former Secretary of the Treasury who had certain holdings. I just wondered if we had any concise picture of the holdings of Secretary Humphrey.

Mr. EBERHARTER. What we have is the number of companies in which he does hold stock. We do not know the number of shares in each of these companies nor do we know their value. That is one thing I would like to have determined.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. On the point the gentleman from Missouri discussed, does the law require a listing of holdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. All I know is that the law passed by the first session of the 81st Congress is very specific in that it requires the Secretary of the Treasury not to engage in trade or business either directly or indirectly, nor to own any seagoing vessel or profit by any operations of any seagoing vessels. Whether the Secretary owns any stock in seagoing vessels I do not know, but

according to his testimony he does own stock in the M. A. Hanna Co., which in turn owns large holdings of stock in other companies which may operate ships.

Mr. PRICE. In the gentleman's opinion, would there be any similarity between the case of the present Secretary and the case of former Secretary Mellon?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think there is some similarity and that is one of the points which I wish would be pursued. Former Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, against whom impeachment proceedings were entered and concerning whom hearings were held before the Committee on the Judiciary of the House on the charge that he was profiting personally from operations of those companies while he was Secretary of the Treasury, therefore, he was violating the law. I think in this instance concerning the present Secretary of the Treasury, it may well be that the Congress should look into his holdings a little more thoroughly and especially the Members of the House should look into the matter.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. At least there would appear to be a conflict of interest. Would the gentleman not agree to that?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not think there is any doubt but that there is some conflict of interest because the Secretary himself is interested, for instance, in these coal companies by reason of the ownership of stock in those companies and he, himself, is the collector of the taxes paid by those companies. So, it would seem to me, there is a conflict of interest.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the matter of holdings of stock by the Secretary of the Treasury, was that matter not gone into by the Senate Finance Committee when his nomination was before that body?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would say that it was gone into to some extent.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Was it not gone into quite completely and to the satisfaction of all Members of the Senate Finance Committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I would not agree with the gentleman in that respect at all. My prepared text will show the exact status of the matter, and if the gentleman will just be patient, I will come to that and explain to him exactly how it was handled according to the printed record.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would like to have the gentleman's views on that, but I want to state to the gentleman as well as to the other Members who are questioning him that the whole thing is in print and can be obtained from the other body, and it can be found from the record just what questions were asked and just what answers were made to the questions.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can you tell us what the present holdings of the present Secretary of the Treasury are? Can you read that from the printed record?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I can tell you what companies he has stock in because it is in the hearings. It is right there.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Can you advise us as to the extent of his holdings?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not know why I should or why he should as far as this particular proceeding here is concerned.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Perhaps, if the gentleman will permit me to read from the law, he may have a different idea after I finish reading the law, and if he would read the record in the case of the impeachment proceedings brought 20 years ago against the Secretary of the Treasury, and if he would read the history of other cases where the other body refused to confirm someone because they were engaged in business. Then, the gentleman might have a different opinion.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman is not contending though that this matter has not been gone into by the committee of the other body, is he?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I certainly think it is pertinent for the Members of the House to know that he has holdings and extensive holdings in various companies. I think it is pertinent for the public to know this because the recommendations coming from the Secretary of the Treasury directly concern the companies, and these shareholders get special benefits from whatever he recommends.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not suggesting that nobody should be interested in this. Certainly, it is a proper question, but my only point is that it has been gone into in the other body, and I would not want the gentleman from Pennsylvania to leave the impression that he now for the first time is bringing this matter up. This matter has been discussed thoroughly and was discussed thoroughly at the time the Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Finance Committee of the other body and answered the questions about all of his business operations.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, the gentleman then agrees that I am right in making more public information which has already secretly, perhaps, been made to some members of the Senate Finance Committee. I am only emphasizing the fact that the Members of the House should know this. Members of the House do not know.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Why not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Because I personally sent a gentleman over there to request from one of the committee aides a copy of the listings by the Secretary of the Treasury of his ownership of stock, and the committee aide said there were none available. That happened in two specific instances. If the gentleman will produce that list and make it public, that is all I want. That is one reason I am taking the time of the House this afternoon. If the gentleman will permit me,

I am not making any charge that this thing is absolutely—that is, I would not want to be accused of finding the Secretary of the Treasury guilty of violating the law—

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. You would just like to infer it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it is proper that this be brought to the attention of the public and to the attention of the House.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think the gentleman has already said that the Secretary was the author of this dividend provision—

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I will have to decline to yield until I have finished the text of my remarks. Then I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let us start with the matter of authorship. The gentleman says that the Secretary of the Treasury is the author of the provision in the revision bill relating to dividends. What is the gentleman's authority for stating that the Secretary is the author? The first time I ever heard the proposal publicly was in the President's budget message of January 21, 1954.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman from Wisconsin realize that the President certainly conferred with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of the Treasury recommended this to the President, which the President took up? So in this administration from its chief fiscal officer we have this recommendation to give special benefit to holders of stock whereby they pay a less rate of taxation, in effect, than those who earn their wages and salaries by the sweat of their brow.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman was present at a number of the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee in 1953?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. He will recall witness after witness who appeared asking the committee to take action in the matter of at least to some extent mitigating the double taxation of corporate income. He remembers that, does he not?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say in answer to that question that I have heard the suggestion many times previously. The fact of the matter is that the Secretary is the author insofar as this administration is concerned of this particular special privilege.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman does not know that because the Secretary has not testified before a committee on this subject.

Mr. EBERHARTER. His representative testified. A representative of the Treasury, who appeared on behalf of the Secretary of the Treasury, said these were the recommendations of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I think if he will

check he will find it is the administration policy, he will find that the President made this recommendation in his budget message of January 21.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Perhaps there is a difference between President Eisenhower and the Secretary of the Treasury on this particular subject. I will be very much interested in listening to see whether the President tonight takes issue with the Secretary of the Treasury on this particular recommendation of the Secretary.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Would it not be a question whether the Secretary of the Treasury takes issue with the position announced by the President as being in favor of this proposal? I would suspect that the Secretary of the Treasury is in favor of it. I am not questioning that, but I am questioning very seriously the gentleman's right to say that the Secretary of the Treasury as such is the sole author of this particular proposal. I would like to ask another question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. We are just splitting hairs, you know. If he wants to deny that he is author I will be very happy indeed to have him do so. The gentleman will not deny that he recommends it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I suspect he did. I will not deny that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman suspects that.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The gentleman says that the Secretary should have furnished our committee—I assume he meant by that the Ways and Means Committee—with a list of his stockholdings?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would be proper.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Has the committee ever asked for that? Did the gentleman ever ask for that in committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I had not the slightest suspicion that the gentleman, being Secretary of the Treasury, would be treated any different than, for instance, the Secretary of Social Security, or whatever her exact title is, Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby. She furnished a list of all her stockholdings, the par value of them and the number of shares, and when they were purchased.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. To our committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. She furnished them to the Finance Committee of the Senate.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I understood the gentleman to say he should have furnished them to the Committee on Ways and Means. Is that what the gentleman means, or did he mean he should have furnished them to the Finance Committee?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think it would have made a big difference if the Committee on Ways and Means knew that he was still holding his stock. It would have made a tremendous difference. Why is the gentleman from Wisconsin complaining so much because I am making public this information?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am not complaining. I say it is the method the gentleman uses to make the information

public. This information has been made public before, and the gentleman can reiterate it all he desires.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin will join with us in a request to the Secretary that he make public a list of his holdings and the extent of them?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is my understanding that the Secretary has; that he has furnished in full compliance with the Senate Finance Committee request a full statement of his stock holdings. That was to the chairman of the Finance Committee.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. But it has never been made public. The general public has no knowledge of that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is not for me to criticize the Senate in what the Senate might do with the document they request. We have not requested it in the past, but I am requesting it today.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would not be surprised if you would probably get it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That would be wonderful, and I hope the gentleman will join with me. As I say, I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will join with the gentleman from Missouri and me in requesting this information. Does the gentleman join us in that request that he make public a list of his holdings, the par value, and the number of shares, and when they were acquired?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly would not resist his making that public, but I would say this to the gentleman, and I intend to take the floor when the gentleman is through, I see where no good purpose can be served one way or the other at this point.

Mr. KARSTEN of Missouri. In view of the fact that the issue has been raised, it would be a good idea to make this public at this time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Wisconsin evidently will not join with us in requesting that this be made public.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not think, in view of the position the gentleman from Pennsylvania is taking here today, that I would join him in any maneuver.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Well, I am glad of that. I am so surprised that the gentleman from Wisconsin is so much shocked at me telling the entire truth about what happened. The New York Times on Saturday contained a story written by a very well-known and reliable correspondent by the name of John Morris. The story by him, under his byline, says that copies of the hearings and information as to the holdings are not available at the committee's office. Now, if the gentleman from Wisconsin wants to contradict the correspondent from the New York Times, that is up to him.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, I will contradict him to this extent, that I called and spoke to Senator MILLIKIN, chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, and asked him whether the Sec-

retary of the Treasury had complied with the request made during the committee hearings on his confirmation. The Senator, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, advised me that he did, that he fully and completely complied with the request within a very short time after the request was made upon the Secretary. That is the extent of my information.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I see. The gentleman, of course, then, I would assume, agrees that this testimony should be kept secret; that is, that his list of holdings should be kept secret. Is that the gentleman's position? I would like to know if that is the gentleman's position. He would not join with us in asking that this information be made public. He objects to my making it public, and I see his argument.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to ask the gentleman about the tax relief on dividends. What would it amount to, financially, for stockholders?

Mr. EBERHARTER. It would amount in the first year to dividend holders the sum of \$240 million, and in the third year of its operation—you see, it gradually creeps up—in the third year it would benefit the stockholders \$850 million, nearly a billion.

Mr. PRICE. How many taxpayers would benefit by that type of relief?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Out of 47 million families in the United States, 335,000 families get the benefit of 80 percent of this \$850 million.

It would be less than 1 percent that would get 80 percent of the benefits of this dividend provision.

Mr. PRICE. I should like to ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman has had long experience in the field of taxation and has been a member of the House Ways and Means Committee for many years. Does the gentleman feel that this sort of tax relief on dividends would have any adverse effect on the municipal bond market?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Naturally, if stockholders are going to receive special benefits, they are going to put all their money in stocks and will not buy any municipal bonds. Municipalities will therefore have to raise the interest rate on their bonds, which will affect the citizens of every local community. Also, so far as the bond issues are concerned, that would be true in the case of new projects being started, because interest rates would be too high. That would also affect wages and salaries.

TAX REVISION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has always been very adept at laying down smokescreens, but I never expected him to stoop to substituting poisonous gas for a smoke-screen. The gentleman refrains from a

direct accusation that the Secretary of the Treasury has used his high office, or is using his high office, for financial gain. He does not do that directly. He does it by inference and inuendo and misstatement.

The Secretary of the Treasury's first sin, I take it, as far as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] is concerned is that he has been successful in business. I recognize that there was a time when not being successful was a qualification for holding high public office, but I am glad to say that is not the case today.

The Secretary of the Treasury has been an officer of some important corporations. That, according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is bad and disqualifies him from being a Secretary of the Treasury. He has saved some money and this money he has invested in stocks under the American capitalistic system. That is bad and disqualifies him from being a Secretary of the Treasury. Those are the sins of the Secretary. In my judgment, it is a healthy sign that we have a Secretary of the Treasury who has ability and has shown it by his success; a Secretary of the Treasury who has confidence in the future of America and American institutions and is willing to put his money into them. I think we are lucky today to have a man like the Secretary of the Treasury who is willing to make the sacrifices that he has made in order to serve his country.

Secretary Humphrey gave up a salary of \$300,000 to take over the job of Secretary of the Treasury at \$22,500. This information is not new, either. This is in the hearings of the Senate Finance Committee on the matter of the confirmation of Mr. Humphrey. Many of these things are.

The difficulty is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is not willing to have us read the record completely and fully. He wants us to look at those parts taken out of context that he wants us to see and that he wants us to read.

A gentleman of the stature of the Secretary of the Treasury certainly did not take the job of Secretary of the Treasury to get some tax laws changed for his own enrichment, and that is the inference made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I think all honest, clean Americans will resent the inference made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me just read to you what the Secretary of the Treasury himself said before the Senate Finance Committee:

Mr. HUMPHREY. Well, Senator, I am coming down here for just one reason. I had no idea, as you well know, of taking this job. It was suggested to me and I spent 3 or 4 days thinking of all the reasons why I should not do it. I wanted to refuse it. My wife and I talked it over and we finally concluded that we really had no decision to make, that when we were asked to try to assist in this program it was a duty and a responsibility that we could not refuse.

I do not want to come here unless everyone is satisfied and happy about it and the feeling is not exactly not only in accordance with the letter of the law but in accordance with the spirit of it and with the confidence of the people. I do not want to do it under any other circumstances.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania not only questions the integrity and the judgment of the Secretary of the Treasury, he also questions the integrity and the judgment of the Senate of the United States and of the Senate Finance Committee. His stockholdings and all of these matters were made a matter of public record and public hearings. The Secretary received the unanimous approval of the Senate Finance Committee. He was confirmed by a unanimous vote of the United States Senate after these hearings.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin furnish me with the list that he just stated was made public?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I did not state that the individual holdings or amounts were; I said that everything that the Senate wanted it got, and everything except that one matter was all a matter of public record. Nobody questioned the need for additional facts before voting on the confirmation of the Secretary of the Treasury, nor did the Senate ask for more information before voting to approve the nomination by the President.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I take it the gentleman objects to my asking that these holdings be made public?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not object to anything the gentleman from Pennsylvania might ask. What the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants is a Secretary of the Treasury who has no savings, who has no job, in fact, who has been a failure. That is the kind of fellow the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants, because that is the only type of person who can qualify under the test suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Let me point to another thing that was brought to the attention of the Senate Finance Committee during the hearings on Mr. Humphrey's confirmation.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Just as soon as I finish this quotation. They were discussing this section of the law to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania was referring. I think it is section 243 of the Code. The Secretary posed this question to the Senate Finance Committee:

Suppose I sold everything that I had. I have thought of that, of course. It would be a tremendous hardship, and whether it could be done or not is a problem, but suppose you did. How would you account for what you received for it? Would you leave it in cash in the bank? If so, would you then be under the compulsion of perhaps favoring in some way that bank because, of course, the Secretary deals with that bank in one way or another. Would you put it in Government bonds? If so, there is nothing that the Secretary of the Treasury could so influence by his conduct as Government bonds.

I can, as Secretary of the Treasury, have more influence on the price of Government bonds and the value of them, a whole lot, than I can on the value of M. A. Hanna common stock when I am no longer an officer, representative, or connected with the firm.

Now you get yourselves into a situation where, if you do not be practical about this thing, that you can so draw the laws that you just cannot have a Secretary of the Treasury unless he is a man who has nothing.

That is what the gentleman from Pennsylvania wants. As far as I am concerned, I want a Secretary of the Treasury in whom I can have some confidence by reason of his past success and his demonstrated ability.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman said before that he did not object to any position I take, but the gentleman is certainly taking up the time of the Congress this afternoon making a speech objecting to the position I take.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly will differ with the gentleman on many occasions, and this occasion I certainly differ with him. Of course, I cannot object to anything the gentleman might decide to do. He must determine that by his own conscience. I do not have to be responsible for that.

One would gather, too, from the gentleman's remarks that the Secretary of the Treasury is the father, the mother, and the attending physician of this provision in the revision bill which would somewhat reduce double taxation of corporate earnings. I do not know how ridiculous one can be, but this certainly should get some kind of a prize because similar proposals have been advanced ever since double taxation got on our statute books in 1936. In 1931, Cordell Hull opposed double taxation and it was not included. You did not have double taxation in the act of 1913 nor did you have it until 1936 when, if you will study the history of the matter, it got in by accident in the other body. I introduced a bill in 1949, H. R. 3272, to mitigate double taxation by allowing a credit to shareholders. I might say to the gentleman, if I must qualify, that I did not have then, nor do I now have, any share holdings. It is possible to propose changes without having a selfish interest. Hearings were held on the tax revision bill in 1953. Representatives of over 28 organizations asked us to do something about double taxation. The minority themselves in the report in 1947 and 1948 admitted that this was a problem that the Congress had to do something about. In every hearing on tax revision conducted by the committee since I have been a member, which is 8 years, and the gentleman knows this as well as I do, representatives have been before the committee requesting that we do something about this problem of double taxation of corporate income. So this is no new idea of the present Secretary of the Treasury. The present Secretary of the Treasury is not even the man who announced it. It was announced by the President of the United States in his budget message of January 21, 1954.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is just what I want to call to the gentleman's attention. President Eisenhower, himself, said that Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey was the person who made this recommendation as well as others on this double taxation.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I certainly must assume, as the gentleman must certainly assume, that the President of the United States in drafting recommendations for tax changes is going to call upon and lean upon his Secretary of the Treasury. There is no question about that. But in the light in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania tries to place this matter, it would appear that the Secretary of the Treasury by some devious, quiet, covered maneuver sneaked into the revision bill a proposal to mitigate the double taxation of corporate earnings, and that he did so to enrich himself. That is what I deny because I have more confidence in the integrity and judgment of our Secretary of the Treasury than to make such an inference.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Would not the gentleman agree that the present Secretary of the Treasury has the philosophy of taxation and views it from the point of view, I would say, of wealthy individuals?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would not say that?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I would deny that. The Secretary of the Treasury views the problem of taxation from the long-run standpoint for the benefit of the general economy of America, and I do not think that the Secretary of the Treasury is approaching this problem of tax revision or this particular proposal from any selfish, individual standpoint, and I resent, I say to the gentleman to his face, I resent his inference that the Secretary would do it for a selfish, personal reason.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would not say that Secretary Humphrey does not have the viewpoint of the wealthy individual in so far as taxation is concerned? You would not say that, would you?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. No, I would not.

Mr. EBERHARTER. You would say he has the viewpoint of the wage earner and the salary earner?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think right now he has the viewpoint of an honorable public servant who is trying to do equity for all of the people. That is what I think.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do you not think it is proper for Members of Congress to know all the facts concerning persons in the position of making recommendations?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I think it is more important to the Members of Congress to know what the recommendations are, and to study them on their merits. There was nothing that forced the Ways and Means Committee or the President of the United States to accept this or any other proposal just because Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey recommended it. We have turned them down in the past. We have turned down some of the other recommendations that the Secretary has made. It is up to the Ways and Means Committee itself; it is up to this House itself to decide what proposals it is going along with. This decision should be made on the merits

of the proposals and not on the basis of who made them.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will say to the gentleman that I am awfully sorry he feels it is necessary to help defend the viewpoint of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Oh, I think the Secretary of the Treasury is in a position to defend himself. I just do not like to see the record stand as it would have stood at the conclusion of the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, casting aspersions on the integrity of the Secretary of the Treasury. I am not going to sit here and let it go by unanswered.

Mr. EBERHARTER. My purpose was to let the people of the country know through whom the recommendations came, and his viewpoint as being that of the viewpoint of the wealthy taxpayers who will get special benefit from this provision.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Well, that is the gentleman's conclusion. I think I will have to refuse to yield further. That is just the gentleman's conclusion. Anybody else is certainly at liberty to analyze the proposals and what they do, analyze the bill and what it does, and see what conclusion they come to as to who will get the benefit, and whether there are selfish interests involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a list of some of the various organizations which have appeared before the Ways and Means Committee supporting the proposal for relief from double taxation on dividends.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(The list referred to follows:)

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE OF RELIEF FOR DOUBLE TAXATION OF DIVIDENDS IN THE HEARINGS OF 1953

American Farm Bureau Federation.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
American Gas Association.
American Institute of Accountants.
American Taxpayers Association of Washington, D. C.
Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce.
Commerce and Industry Association of New York.
Research Institute of America.
Council of State Chambers of Commerce.
Georgia State Chamber of Commerce.
American Mining Congress.
National Machine Tool Builders Association.
New York Stock Exchange.
Independent Natural Gas Association of America.
Investors League, Inc.
Philadelphia Securities Association.
Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.
Association of Stock Exchange Firms.
American Stock Exchange.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Association of Wool Manufacturers.
Edison Electric Institute.
Lake Superior Iron Ore Association.
National Coal Association.
Federal Tax Forum.

Southwestern Public Service Co.
General Public Utilities Corp.
Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE IN THE HEARINGS OF 1950

Illinois Manufacturers Association.
Smaller Business Association of New England.

Investment Bankers Association of America.

New York Board of Trade.
Committee for Economic Development.

ADDITIONAL ORGANIZATIONS WHICH SUPPORTED THE PRINCIPLE IN THE HEARINGS OF 1947-48

Independent Telephone Companies Association.

National Tool and Die Manufacturers Association.

Chamber of Commerce of the City of Newark.

American Retail Federation.

In addition, the principle has been advanced by:

Association of American Railroads, Committee on the Federal Corporate Net Income Tax of the National Tax Association, report of August 1950.

Ruml, B., and Sonne, H. C., Fiscal and Monetary Policy, National Planning Association, July 1944.

Kimmel, Lewis H., Postwar Tax Policy and Business Expansion, Brookings, 1943.

Seligman, Eustace, A Postwar Program for Taxation of Corporations and Stockholders, Commercial & Financial Chronicle, March 2, 1944.

Eccles, M. S., Possibilities of Postwar Inflation and Suggested Tax Action, Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1944.

The Twin Cities Plan, Postwar Taxes, Twin Cities Research Bureau, Inc., June 1944.

Revenue Revision, 1947-48, Report of the Special Tax Study Committee to the Committee on Ways and Means, November 4, 1947.

Committee on Postwar Tax Policy, 1947.

House Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning, 78th Cong., 2d session, 1944.

INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and to include tables which I have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic minority in the House of Representatives has criticized the Republican-sponsored Internal Revenue Code of 1954, H. R. 8300. The demagogic attack led by the Truman wing of the Democratic Party on this legislation has disregarded the facts and has endeavored for political purposes to mislabel this legislation as a bill designed to aid only corporations.

Such unfounded allegations could not be further from the truth. These irresponsible charges have been made in the face of the facts which point up that the tax relief afforded by this legislation will offer a reduction in tax liability to individuals of \$778 million and will be largely paid for by an increase in the tax liability of corporations of \$581 million. The net revenue loss resulting from the bill for fiscal year 1955 will be \$197 million. A more detailed statistical statement of

the tax benefits resulting from passage of H. R. 8300 is as follows:

Effect on receipts, fiscal year 1955, of measures contained in your committee's bill—

(Millions of dollars)

	Loss	Gain
Individuals:		
Items having permanent effect:		
Full split income for head of family	50	-----
Dividends received, exclusion and credit ¹	240	-----
Taxation of annuities on life expectancy	10	-----
Deduction for certain dependents regardless of earnings ¹	75	-----
Dependent deduction for member of taxpayer's household who meets support test	10	-----
Retirement-income credit	125	-----
Deduction of interest charges in installment contracts	10	-----
Medical-expense deduction	80	-----
Child-care deduction	40	-----
Personal exemption for estates and trust	3	-----
Premium test on life insurance	25	-----
Increase in charitable contribution limitation from 20 percent to 30 percent	25	-----
Subtotal	693	-----
Items which merely shift deduction or income between taxable years:		
Soil- and water-conservation expenditures ¹	10	-----
Depreciation ¹	75	-----
Subtotal	85	-----
Combined effect for individuals	778	-----
Corporations:		
Items having direct revenue effect:		
Natural resources ²	27	-----
Treatment of income from foreign sources ²	147	-----
Subtotal ²	174	-----
Items which merely shift deductions or income between taxable years:		
Depreciation ¹	200	-----
Net operating loss deduction ^{1,2}	100	-----
Accounting provisions ²	45	-----
Subtotal ²	445	-----
Total ²	619	-----
Extension of 52 percent rate for 1 year		1,200
Combined effect on corporations ²		581
Grand total, individuals and corporations	197	-----

¹ Items with substantial incentive effects.

² A small part of this estimate applies to individuals, but this cannot be clearly segregated.

NOTE.—Many other provisions in the bill which do not involve an important revenue loss at the present time are also expected to stimulate production and employment. These include such provisions as the new treatment for research and development expenditures and the more liberal capital gains treatment provided for investors.

The American public will not be deluded by these misrepresentations of the Democratic Party. Millions of individual taxpayers will directly benefit from enactment of H. R. 8300. Among the provisions included in the bill which will aid our overburdened taxpayers are a broader definition of dependents; permitting children to earn over \$600 a year without loss of the exemption for their parents; an exemption of up to \$1200 of retirement income; a greatly liberalized medical deduction; a broader exemption of death benefits paid to the widows of employees; fairer treatment of home owners where they sell their homes; liberalized deductions for contributions to schools, churches and hospitals; allowance of deductions for child care expenses of working mothers; extension of the income tax exemption of members

of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; and many other reforms.

The Truman Democrats criticize the Republican Party for granting this type of long overdue tax relief. They advocate instead an increase in personal exemptions of \$100 which would cost the Federal Treasury \$2.3 billion and give little relief to an individual taxpayer.

Let us examine the sincerity and benefit of this Democratic proposal.

First of all I will deal with the question of how sincere are the Democrats in advocating an increase in personal exemptions. During the 20 years of Democratic misrule they led us down an endless path of tax and tax, spend and spend. When the Republicans left office in 1932 personal exemptions were \$2,500 a year. The Democrats whittled away at this allowance until they had reduced it to \$500. The Republican 80th Congress finally raised the personal exemption to \$600, raised the dependency allowance to \$600, gave an additional \$600 exemption for the blind and for our old people. We can well ask ourselves why the sudden solicitude for our American taxpayers by the minority Democratic Party. The record of the past 20 years contains nothing to suggest such concern while the Democrats were in the majority.

Now let us examine the so-called benefits to the American taxpayer which the Democrats would grant in lieu of the substantial benefits contained in H. R. 8300 I previously enumerated. The following table sets forth the tax saving that would be realized by individuals in various income categories with dependents as listed from the Democratic proposal to increase personal exemptions by \$100.

Gross income	Amount of tax reduction per week		
	Single person	Married couple	Married couple, 2 dependents
\$700	\$0.38	-----	-----
\$1,000	.38	-----	-----
\$1,400	-----	\$0.77	-----
\$2,000	.38	.77	-----
\$2,800	-----	-----	\$1.54
\$3,000	.42	.77	1.54
\$4,000	.42	.77	1.54
\$5,000	.50	.77	1.54
\$8,000	.58	.85	1.69
\$10,000	.65	1.00	1.69
\$15,000	.90	1.15	2.31
\$20,000	1.02	1.31	2.62
\$25,000	1.13	1.46	2.92
\$50,000	1.38	2.27	4.54
\$100,000	1.67	2.77	5.54
\$300,000	1.75	3.42	6.85
\$500,000	1.75	3.50	7.00
\$1,000,000	1.75	3.50	7.00

The Democrats would force the Republican administration to abandon its efforts to achieve fiscal solvency in our Federal finances in order to give tax relief of 50 cents per week. These irresponsible advocates of deficit financing would grant this 50-cent relief at a cost of \$2.3 billion.

The Democratic tax program would perpetuate existing tax inequities and create new ones. They would deny to business, to labor, and to the farmer the stimulation to our economy that will in-

evitably result from passage of H. R. 8300.

THE HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY HUMPHREY

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I am glad I was here to listen to the colloquy between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] for the fine reply which he made to the attack on my distinguished fellow townsman, George Humphrey. I know of no man who is giving more to his country than is George Humphrey. I know of no more brilliant public servant, wholly unselfish, and deeply concerned about the public welfare.

The Secretary of the Treasury is a man of triple talents. In the years since George M. Humphrey graduated from the University of Michigan law school, he has succeeded as an attorney, industrialist, and financier. In Cleveland, where he has lived for many years, and in industrial centers across the land, he is regarded as a man who gets things done. He deserves this reputation.

Mr. Humphrey left a thriving law practice in 1917 to join the staff of the M. A. Hanna Co., now the largest of Cleveland's many ore dealers and an important contributor to the growth of that city. In 1920, at the age of 30, he was made a partner; 5 years later, vice president and general manager. His genius pulled the company out of a serious post-war slump and started it on a continuing program of expansion. Under his management, Hanna obtained control of the biggest coal company in the world, one of the larger steel companies and a rayon and plastics corporation. It sponsored exploration into undeveloped ore fields. It acquired its own fleet of boats to expedite the movement of ore from northern regions to Pittsburgh furnaces. It produced private investment money to build 385 miles of modern double-track railroad into remote Canadian ore country.

When genial George Humphrey moved into the Cabinet circle, he was chairman of the board of Hanna and its subsidiary companies; director of a Cleveland bank and two Canadian companies. He has served on the boards of numerous business, educational and charitable organizations and holds the Rand medal for distinguished achievement in mining administration. For him, there are always new horizons.

As a businessman, George Humphrey liked to compare the Nation's wealth to a pie which must be divided among more and more people. Under a controlled economy, the slices become thinner and thinner. Under a free economy—the American economy—the enterprising citizen is encouraged to “bake another pie.”

George Humphrey is no longer in the banking business. But while he was, he developed sound judgment, a great capacity for work and a grasp of economic principles which are proving invaluable to him in his job.

George Humphrey is the servant of all the people and is giving the people of America the same fine service that he gave to the stockholders of his company and to the citizens of my community.

I am surprised that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], would make any insinuations about his being the servant of a privileged few. The job of Secretary of the Treasury as it is being performed by Mr. Humphrey is one that every citizen of America, whether he be Republican, Democrat, or Mugwump, can be proud of. He is attending to his job; he is on the job day and night, serving this country to the best of his ability.

As a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, it was my privilege last February 2 to hear Treasury Secretary Humphrey in his report to our committee. On that occasion, he said:

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to appear before your committee this morning to discuss the 1954 Economic Report of the President which was submitted to the Congress last week.

I subscribe to the conclusion of the report to the effect that this Nation can make the transition to a period of less costly military preparedness without serious interruption in our economic growth. As the President says in the letter of transmittal, there is much that justifies confidence in the future.

Changes which this administration has put into effect, as well as others which have been recommended, in the tax structure, contribute greatly to our confidence in the future.

As you gentlemen well know, this administration in the past 12 months has cut more than \$12 billion in anticipated Government spending. This reduction in proposed spending made possible the tax cuts on January 1. These cuts now are leaving with the taxpayers over \$5 billion a year which formerly was spent by the Government. We are cutting taxes, even though we have not arrived at a budget balance. There is a very good reason for this. We must always anticipate the reduction of Government expenditures and begin to transfer billions of dollars which the Government will not be spending back to the taxpayers so that there will not be any sudden dislocation resulting from the lack of those dollars being available to be put into the Nation's spending stream. In that way we help to maintain stability.

It is important to notice that we expect to almost reach a cash balance this year—and a small cash surplus in fiscal 1955. We are thus eliminating the necessity for cash deficit financing from the public which is inflationary particularly in times of high levels of activity. At the same time we are moving closer each year to an administrative budget balance, which is a goal we are determined to reach.

In addition to the \$5 billion tax cuts of January 1, we are recommending a general revision of the tax system. It will do two principal things:

1. It will make the tax burden fairer for millions of individuals by removing the more serious tax inequities and complications.

2. It will stimulate production and create bigger payrolls and more and better jobs by reducing restraints and by encouraging initiative and investment.

Millions of Americans will benefit from better tax treatment for working children,

child care expenses, for doctors' bills, for annuities, and from easier procedures in filing returns.

And these same millions will benefit even more from such revisions as liberalization of the tax treatment of depreciation and partial relief from double taxation of dividends. Everyone will benefit because the economy will benefit with the resulting creation of more jobs with better tools and machinery to produce higher payrolls and cheaper better things for public consumption.

The tax revision program, by helping the economy to grow and expand, will benefit every citizen, with steadier employment and higher standards of living.

In this connection the proposal for some relief from the double taxation of dividends may not be well understood. Under present law, earnings of a corporation are taxed twice—once as corporation income and again as individual income when they are paid out in dividends to the millions of shareholders in American industry. This has restricted the market for shares of stock in companies which want to expand and has forced them to borrow money instead of selling shares in their future. In the past 10 years better than 75 percent of private-industry financing has been done by going in debt instead of selling shares. What does this mean? It means simply that we have enterprise heavily in debt so that it doesn't develop as well or as quickly as it would without heavy debts hanging over it. Should business turn down, a company in heavy debt is, of course, easily drawn into trouble.

Better prospects for enabling companies to get shareholder financing—instead of going into debt—thus means better prospects for all Americans who work, for increasingly better jobs come more surely out of companies that are moving forward and expanding.

There has also been some misunderstanding about what we are proposing in depreciation. Depreciation is really the wrong word. Buildings and machinery not only wear out but they become old fashioned and neither the workman using them nor the business owning them do as well either in earning wages or in decreasing costs as more modern, up-to-date equipment would make possible. Depreciation is simply the method by which the original cost of a building or piece of machinery is recovered over the years during which it is being used up and worn out. At the moment these deductions must usually be spread out evenly over the years for tax purposes. But if the cost of a piece of machinery has not been written off by the time it should be replaced with the better machinery, there is less inclination to buy a new piece of machinery that will do the job better and cheaper than keeping the old machinery still in use. Our proposal to let more depreciation be taken in early years does not increase the total that may be taken as tax deduction by one cent. It simply recognizes the facts and allows more of the deduction in earlier years. Doing so helps our economy to stay modern and up to date, and so to grow and expand faster. And again repeating the obvious, out of this growing economy come more and better jobs. It also is very helpful to the small and growing concern in arranging its finances for new purchases of additional or more modern equipment and so aids small business to forge ahead.

Nothing can so add to our national strength and preparedness as modernization of the whole industrial plant in America and nothing will make more sure more jobs at which millions of people can earn high wages by producing more and better goods at less cost.

These revisions, as they help our economy expand and reduce the taxes required, will also result in more personal income to be spent by taxpayers for their own account

and in their own way and so will provide more money for the purchase of those better goods and services.

Additional tax cuts for all the taxpayers will, of course, benefit them. But until more reductions in Government expenditures are in sight further cuts in taxes will only add to the deficit. However, as rapidly as reduced expenditures can be seen, further tax reductions will promptly be made. In the meanwhile, putting first things first, we must make sure we are doing the things that by restoring initiative will keep our economy expanding. More tax cuts from the paycheck will be of little value if there is no job to make the paycheck in the first place.

As long as Americans know there is adequate chance for gain they will save and invest. They will try new things that will bring forward new business, growing business, more jobs, better jobs, and higher and better standards of living.

In the past decade the growth of American industry was stimulated by debt and war and inflation. With these unwanted pressures fading, we need to again make initiative and enterprise more compelling if our economy is to continue to grow.

That growth stimulated by tax relief and reduction to almost every taxpayer in the Nation is the basic purpose of our tax program.

We believe that this tax program will help to build a firm foundation for the future health of our economy and that we can look to the future with great confidence.

This is the best answer I can think of in addition to that of the distinguished gentleman of Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], to the unfortunate and ill-considered comment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

When Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected to the Presidency in 1932, he said he would cut taxes 25 percent. He was elected because the people believed him. He took office with a debt of approximately \$21 billion. Today we have a debt of approximately \$270 billion, plus \$70 billion more in IOU's.

We all want to cut taxes, Mr. Speaker. I recall a statement made by my former colleague from Pennsylvania, Bob Rich, who consistently asked, "Where are you going to get the money?" Now we are raising money to pay for all the bungling and squandering on the part of the previous two administrations. Now we are struggling to reduce taxes. In the Republican-controlled 80th Congress we first balanced the budget, reduced taxes, and lived within our income.

The taxes were reduced by \$14 billion last year, and they will be reduced by five or six billion dollars this year. Every Republican wants to remove all taxes possible, but where are you going to get the money to pay these bills? We are removing people from the Federal payroll as rapidly as possible in all departments.

It is easy to demagog about taxes. Every citizen wants tax relief. I wish we could cut all taxes, but we are faced with reality. We have a job to do here; we have a problem to meet that we did not create. We Republicans were not a part of the outfit that dragged us into a couple of wars and then made bum deals at Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran. We are not responsible for those things. Why put the blame at the door of the Republican Party or a great servant of the

people, George Humphrey, for trying to bring relief and solve the problems?

Mr. EBERHARTER, my party, including Mr. Humphrey, did not reduce the dollar to a 50-cent piece.

Mr. EBERHARTER, Mr. Humphrey and the Republicans did not increase the national debt from \$21 billion in 1932 to \$275 billion in 1953. I want to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], Mr. Humphrey did not increase the cost of government from \$5 billion in 1932 to \$78 billion in 1953.

Mr. EBERHARTER, neither my party nor Mr. Humphrey was responsible for the recognition of the Soviet Union. Neither George Humphrey nor the Republicans coddled Alger Hiss, let Gerhardt Eisler escape, nor blocked every effort to smoke communism out of the Government. Neither the Republicans nor George Humphrey made the disastrous agreements at Yalta. George Humphrey did not order the police action in Korea. Neither George Humphrey nor the Republicans were responsible for the blundering policy which lost China to the Reds. I am sure it wasn't the Republicans nor George Humphrey that fired General MacArthur. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that neither the Republicans nor George Humphrey brought us a spurious prosperity by war and mortgaged the future through debt. The distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] cannot blame the Republicans nor George Humphrey for the extravagant fiscal policies which have brought on inflation and then cried for greater authority to bring on more of the same to stop inflation. My genial friend from Pennsylvania cannot dispute the fact that in 1947 for the first and only time since 1932, the Republicans did balance the national budget and that Republicans for the first time in 20 years reduced taxes. I am sure my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that my party warned us of the dangers of annual deficits and the huge national debt, and he cannot deny that the Republicans fought waste and extravagance in Government and stood for the preservation of the Constitution and upheld the liberty of the individual against encroachments of government itself. Besides, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that the Republicans championed the cause of free enterprise on every front constantly and fought socialism and the welfare state. My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] will agree that the Republican Party is the one which believes that there is nothing iniquitous in loving one's country above all others nor dishonorable in considering the welfare of the United States their first obligation.

The Ways and Means Committee which reports to us this week does so with a voluminous record of painstaking performance. They recommend a bill that is realistic and sound.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike at this late hour to take so much time—this is my first offense during this 2-year period of Con-

gress. But I just cannot stand this demagogery on the part of some Members who are placing the responsibility for this mess where it does not belong; and it is about time that we called a spade a spade. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] or any other gentleman on that side wants to have it out tomorrow or the next day we are ready for them. I do not like this partisanship on the floor of the House; I have tried to steer away from it.

In November 1952, the people of America voted to stop the war in Korea. We have stopped it.

The people of our country voted to get rid of security risks in our Government. They meant all kinds of risks—the Communists, the drunks, the playboys, the "cookie pushers." We have gotten rid of 2,000 of them, so far.

Our people told us to throw out the Communists, the pinks, the fellow travelers who infested Washington. We have thrown them out.

Sixteen months ago we were told to stop wasting your tax money. We cut the Truman budget by \$14 billion, and this year we are cutting another \$6 billion.

The people of America told us to change the foreign policy which lost in time of peace, what our Armed Forces had won in time of war. We have changed that foreign policy. Today America is leading the world where the Kremlin was misleading it 2 years ago.

Our people told us in the last election that they were sick of scandals and corruption in the Federal Government. Have they forgotten the mink coats, the deep freezes, the 5 percent boys? I don't think so, but if anyone has, we Republicans are going to remind him of what Washington was like before Ike, and what it is like now, with Ike.

The biggest single responsibility in the world today is the job held by President Eisenhower. No man can do it alone. Our position of world leadership at this crucial moment in history requires the cooperation of Congress and the White House. We are trying to achieve it.

In the opening days of the second session of this Congress, I sense a deep recognition of this truth. We are starting out, on both sides of the political fence, with a real determination to work harmoniously for the public welfare. Let me add in all frankness that this harmony may not last beyond the winter's snows.

There are fundamental disagreements between the 2 parties on both goals and methods. I hope that we can resolve our differences and give our united support to President Eisenhower's basic program.

As I see it, the program on which we must agree will be centered on two principal areas: First and foremost must be a new foreign policy. We have helped our allies in their effort to get off the floor. Now they can be asked to support themselves without weakening the Western World. We have reached the point where American taxpayers will refuse to underwrite nations which do not choose to defend themselves.

We have come to the time when it seems absurd to draft American boys for

the defense of nations which are unwilling to draft theirs.

In other words, the moment has arrived for our country to exercise moral and economic leadership without providing troops, ships and planes to protect every critical spot on the globe. If this means talking hard-boiled language to our friends in France, Italy, and Great Britain, let's start talking that way. They understand determination. They despise weakness.

A realistic foreign policy means that Uncle Sam can look a little more carefully at his own home and garden. It can stand a good look. We have been draining taxpayers to the point where the golden goose is growing anemic. Our tax policies have hit hard at the little fellow as well as the big investor. It is time for us to overhaul the Internal Revenue Code.

We have assumed certain obligations to our aged and our dependent men, women, and children. If this is to be something more than a hollow gesture, we must make some realistic adjustments in the benefits they receive.

On the economic home front, I see our job in Congress as one of stimulating private enterprise. There are great new fields to conquer. Atomic energy for peacetime uses; electronics; new lightweight metals; private airplanes for the average worker; chemicals for industry and home use; all these and more are products to stir the American imagination. In Congress, we can furnish the leadership necessary to fire up these industries. Or we can stifle this process.

President Eisenhower has shown that he believes in America. I believe with him that this faith in our future can overcome every obstacle.

If Congress can avoid the temptation to view every proposal as a political issue, we shall go far. I am optimistic because I am convinced that the best politics in our times is American idealism. That is how I intend to look at every problem before us, from atomic energy to the fight on communism.

What is good for America must be good for the world. What is good for America is certainly what Congress must consider. That and nothing else.

PROCUREMENT

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and insert a letter dated March 12, 1954, from Hon. Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, on the subject of procurement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have for many months questioned the procurement policies of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and the actions of the military services in carrying out such policies, as being contrary to the intent of the Congress as expressed in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and the House and Senate reports accompanying this act.

The reports accompanying the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 referred to the time-tested method of competitive bidding and stated that competitive bidding would be the rule in procurement for the military services and negotiation would be only the permissible exception.

While high Government officials have been telling the people that we have returned to a virtually free economy, with economic controls abolished on all items, there has been an unwillingness to cease negotiating almost nine-tenths of the contracts for military supplies and services under the emergency provisions of procurement legislation. I have previously stated that negotiation should not be used for mere convenience, but should be used only when necessary. The interest of small-business concerns also dictates that there be a return to competitive bidding since in 1953 small-business concerns were awarded 65.9 percent of the advertising competitive-bid contracts in comparison with only 10.1 percent of the negotiated contracts.

It is encouraging to know that there is an arm of the Congress having equal interest with this body in carrying out the intent of the Congress and safeguarding the best interest of the Government. I refer to Hon. Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, and those who assist him in carrying out this responsibility. Those of us who have been here for many years remember him as an honest, capable, fearless, and hard-working Member of the Congress, and one who was selected for his present position on the basis of his high qualifications.

Due to the high regard which I have for Lindsay Warren, and his long experience in procurement matters, I recently wrote a letter and requested his views regarding whether existing procurement legislation adequately protects the interest of the Government in negotiated contracts, for his suggestions as to the manner in which any existing deficiencies may be remedied, and for his opinion as to whether the joint determination program for small-business concerns could be effectively continued under advertised bidding if negotiated contracts are further restricted.

I received a reply from the Comptroller General dated March 12, 1954, setting forth his views on the above questions. I recommend this letter for the immediate attention of the Office of Defense Mobilization and the military services with regard to their present interpretations of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 and existing orders and regulations.

I further recommend this letter to the attention of all who are concerned with amending existing procurement legislation. On the day that Congress convened I introduced H. R. 6864 for the purpose of amending section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, and the Comptroller General also recommends amending the same section.

I further recommend this letter to the attention of all who are interested in the welfare of small-business concerns, and a return to competitive bidding in the interest of small business.

The above referred to letter dated March 12, 1954, from the Comptroller General of the United States is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF
THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 12, 1954.
Hon. PAUL BROWN,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BROWN: I have your letter of February 11, 1954, requesting my views as to whether existing legislation, particularly the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, adequately protects the interest of the Government in negotiated contracts.

You mention specifically section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act, which permits negotiation of contracts during the period of a national emergency if determined to be necessary in the public interest, and state it to be your understanding that all negotiated contracts are now awarded under this section of the act. Your letter suggests that an unusually broad interpretation has been placed on what is "necessary in the public interest" under section 2 (c) (1), and you cite the example of a contract for 3 destroyers recently awarded by the Department of the Navy at a price \$6,500,000 in excess of the lowest price obtainable.

Apart from the merits of the particular award in the case of the 3 destroyers, it is my opinion that the authority granted by section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act currently is being exercised under circumstances which were not contemplated by the Congress when the act was passed. It was clearly intended that there would be a return to normal advertising-bid purchasing procedures on the part of the armed services, whenever economic conditions permitted. See Senate Report No. 571, 80th Congress. Various deviations from such procedures—some of long standing and others derived from World War II procurement experience—were recognized and made uniform by the act. The exception contained in section 2 (c) (1) of the act is among the latter. Because of the prospect that any future war might start with great suddenness, it was felt by the Congress that standby authority should be available on a permanent basis to permit the shedding of peacetime procurement restrictions simultaneously with the declaration of a national emergency by the President or the Congress. In other words, this section of the act was designed to make it unnecessary to secure temporary authority from the Congress to negotiate contracts upon the outbreak of a sudden emergency when valuable time might be lost in going through the legislative process. However, use of the authority provided under section 2 (c) (1) was intended only to meet abnormal market and procurement conditions. This is borne out by the fact that a state of declared war existed at the time the act was passed, but it was in effect agreed between the Congress and the armed services that that emergency would not be made the basis for the exercise of authority under section 2 (c) (1).

Provision was made for a further determination to be made by the heads of the procuring agencies even after the presidential or congressional declaration of a national emergency before section 2 (c) (1) authority could be used. The determination to be made is that negotiation of contracts is necessary in the public interest. No standards are set forth in the act for the guidance of the agency heads in evaluating the various factors which may affect the public interest. It is clear, however, that the mere existence of a declared national emergency, without more, was not to be made the basis for any blanket exercise of the negotiating authority.

As you know, the President declared a national emergency on December 16, 1950.

Immediately thereafter, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force made broad general determinations that it was necessary in the public interest to authorize the negotiation of contracts by their respective departments under section 2 (c) (1) during the period of the national emergency. Similar determinations were soon made by the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard and the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. While the use of formal advertising was permitted as an alternative to negotiation, it is significant to note that nearly nine-tenths of the total procurement activities of the Department of Defense since 1950 have been on a negotiated as distinguished from an advertised basis, although the proportion of advertised procurements has increased somewhat in recent months. Also, as provided by implementing procurement regulations issued by the three services, such negotiation has been on the basis of section 2 (c) (1) authority even in cases where negotiation would have been justified under other exceptions contained in section 2 (c) of the Armed Services Procurement Act.

One result of the exclusive use of section 2 (c) (1) authority has been to render inoperative the limitations of section 7 (b), 7 (c), and 7 (d) of the Armed Services Procurement Act with respect to the delegation of authority by the agency heads and the requirement of reports to the Congress in the case of contracts negotiated under sections 2 (c) (11) and 2 (c) (16). The award for the three destroyers mentioned in your letter is a good example. It appears from testimony given before the Subcommittee on Defense Activities of the House Armed Services Committee on February 26, 1954, that the award in this case was in reality made on the basis of reasons which would bring it within the purview of section 2 (c) (16) of the act, namely, the desire of the Navy Department to insure the continued operation of the shipyard involved.

The questionable features of the Department of Defense buying practices stem, of course, from the extremely broad authority granted by section 2 (c) (1). Two things only are necessary to render that section operative: First, a declaration of national emergency either by the President or by the Congress; and second, a determination by the agency head that such emergency makes negotiation of contracts necessary in the public interest. This is just one more in a series of instances which I have witnessed during my term as Comptroller General where freedom from checks and controls has given rise to administrative abuse.

As stated above, the act does not establish standards for determining when or to what degree the public interest requires negotiation under section 2 (c) (1). However, the legislative history of the act indicates rather clearly that section 2 (c) (1) authority was intended to be used only when normal peacetime procurement was not practicable. The House report on the bill (H. Rept. No. 109, 80th Cong., p. 6) shows that advertising was expected to be used when definite specifications could be offered to a number of adequately equipped potential suppliers who would compete for the business, and that resort to negotiation would be had only when one or more of these three conditions was missing. I can find no basis for believing that "public interest" under section 2 (c) (1) was ever intended to encompass savings in unemployment compensation, tax losses, idle machines, impact on communities, lost sales, or relief payments, as has been argued by the Office of Defense Mobilization. See the third annual report of the Activities of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, House Report No. 1097, 83d Congress, page 20. It is significant, in this connection, that section 644 of the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1954 (67 Stat.

357), prohibits the use of funds made available thereunder for the payment of a price differential on contracts made for the purpose of relieving economic dislocations.

Conditions today, fortunately, are far less urgent than those prevailing in December 1950 when the present national emergency was declared. In fact, conditions affecting Government procurement are today relatively stable. Although these changed conditions should permit far more procurement on a normal basis, no change has been made in the broad determinations made by the Secretaries of the Armed Services over 3 years ago. It is believed that the congressional interest in the destroyer contract may have impressed upon the Department of the Navy the desirability of a review of the present necessity for continuance of section 2 (c) (1) authority on the broad basis now in effect, and it was stated at the hearing on February 26, 1954, that such a review was under way.

In response to your request for suggestions which might more adequately protect the interests of the Government in negotiated procurement, I believe periodic administrative review of the necessity for continuance of section 2 (c) (1) authority should be made mandatory perhaps by providing that agency head determinations thereunder should not be made for periods in excess of 6 months at a time. A more drastic limitation would be to permit negotiation under section 2 (c) (1) only during time of actual hostilities and 12 months thereafter and to require express legislative sanction for negotiating authority during any other periods. I do not at present, in view of the limited use of negotiation under the other subsections of section 2 (c), have any suggestions with respect thereto. The authority to negotiate under those subsections is, of course, subject to many limitations and safeguards not applicable to negotiation under subsection 2 (c) (1).

You also request my views as to the effect upon small business of further restrictions on negotiated procurement. My comments will be limited to the effect of modification of section 2 (c) (1), since I have not suggested further restriction on the use of negotiation under section 2 (c) (2) through 2 (c) (17). Section 214 of the Small Business Act of 1953 (67 Stat. 238), provides that small-business concerns shall receive any award or contract or any part thereof as to which it is determined by the Small Business Administration and the contracting procurement agency (A) to be in the interest of mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, or (B) to be in the interest of war or national defense programs. So long as this statutory authority exists for earmarking a fair share of Government procurement for small business, it would seem to be immaterial whether the contracts are let on a negotiated or an advertised basis. While the conditions may since have changed, it is not inappropriate to point out that the Senate Select Committee on Small Business in a report dated June 21, 1951 (S. Rept. 459, 82d Cong., p. 33), made the following recommendation:

"3. The committee is convinced that small producers fare best under the formal advertised bidding procedure. It therefore strongly urges the use of advertised procurements to the fullest extent practicable. In fact, it is of the firm belief that negotiation should be drastically restricted and employed only for urgent or classified purchases, or when definite benefits to small business may ensue."

In my opinion, therefore, the discontinuance of negotiation under section 2 (c) (1) of the Armed Services Procurement Act should have no detrimental effect upon the volume of procurement from small business.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

OAK RIDGE, A GOVERNMENT COMPANY TOWN

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, Oak Ridge is a community of approximately 35,000 inhabitants. As everyone knows, it is the principal atomic-energy installation. The United States Government owns every single dwelling, with the exception of the recent FHA housing, every business establishment, including the buildings where lawyers have their offices, doctors, and dentists their offices. Even the place where the shoe cobbler fixes your shoes is owned by our Government.

Oak Ridge is in the category of the 19th century "company town." This is fundamentally wrong. Ever since I came to Congress a little over 3 years ago, I have urged the Atomic Energy Commission to make these homes available for purchase by the occupants. I have urged them to get out of the housing business. The United States Government should not be the landlord for its citizens.

I have urged AEC time after time to give the citizens of Oak Ridge the same privileges as other American citizens enjoy. Oak Ridge should be and must be a normal American community. All I have gotten so far is promises—no action.

I understand that the disposal plan is either in the hands of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or shortly will be. I urge that open hearings be had at once on a fair disposal plan and that action be had now, not wait until the next session of the Congress.

I believe that this is in line with the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

All persons employed at Oak Ridge should be eligible to purchase their own homes on long-term credit and to purchase the thousands of unneeded and unused building lots in Oak Ridge so that they can build homes thereon.

There should be no 45-mile limit as to eligibility for housing. There should be no limit, except that every person employed at Oak Ridge should have the right to own their own homes, to build their own homes, and to enjoy the rights and privileges of American citizens.

When a citizen of the United States is deprived of the right to buy and own his own home, he is deprived of his freedom and that is not the American way of life.

[From the Oak Ridger, Oak Ridge, Tenn., of March 9, 1954]

"HOUSING DEFINITELY EASING" (FORD)—FORTY-FIVE-MILE LIMIT SEEN ON WAY OUT—MSI LIST IS DOWN 2,000 NAMES—MORE THAN HALF TITLE 8 READY

The long-controversial "reasonable commuting distance" restriction on occupancy of local Government housing may end soon, AEC officials said today.

The Oak Ridge housing situation is "definitely easing up," Fred W. Ford, head of the AEC Office of Community Affairs, said at this morning's biweekly press conference.

Vacancies in present Government units are increasing by 20 per week. The housing application lists at Management Services, Inc., have been reduced by approximately 2,000 listings since February 1.

More and more title 8 and title 9 housing units are being completed weekly. Over half of the 500 title 8 units in East Village are now finished and ready for occupancy.

All of these factors contribute to the steady loosening in the local housing market that has been noticeable primarily since the beginning of the year.

As a result, Ford foresees a continuing program of relaxing and dispensing with local housing restrictions and he believes the commuting-distance provision will be one of the first to go.

Already, he explained, MSI housing officials are studying the practicability of ending this rule which provides that anyone presently housed within 45 miles of Oak Ridge is not eligible for housing here. The 45-mile limit has been written into local housing policy as the reasonable commuting distance.

If this provision were to end, scores of local workers now living in surrounding communities would become eligible for all local housing. They have been eligible for title 8 and title 9 units for the past several months. However, many have been on lists for other local homes.

In addition to the 45-mile limit Ford said that other restrictions are also being examined periodically with an eye to relaxing or ending them. He did not elaborate but presumably he meant the family size and job importance factors which determine the assignment of many local units.

Ford had said early this year, as MSI's change in procedure in assigning housing went into effect on February 1, that it was hoped that this would be a decisive step toward a "free and open" housing market in Oak Ridge which might come about by the end of this year.

The MSI housing application lists that have decreased so substantially are those which were turned over to MSI on February 1 by all local employers, listing all of the local employees who sought housing here, and the type of unit sought.

These lists, at first, showed 5,300 listings, MSI reported. Now they show only 3,300, Ford said today. Still on the lists are many duplications of applications. Ford explained, with many residents having applied for several types of local units. Some are on as many as 4 or 5 lists while the average number of listings per applicant is 2 or 3.

Ford said that most of the present vacancies are in the city's apartment units. As of today, 42 of the 453 Garden Apartment units are empty.

Ford explained also that as quickly as possible various segments of local housing will be placed on "nonquota" lists. That is, these units may be rented without regard to restrictions as long as the applicant is employed in Oak Ridge. Officials have said in the past that E-apartments were on the verge of being placed on "nonquota" status.

Title Eight rental officials reported that approximately 29 units were unassigned as of today. A total of 260 of the East Village units are now completed with 231 occupied or with tenants assigned. The vacant units are available to any Oak Ridge employee. All one need do to be assigned 1 of these 3-bedroom units which rent for \$85 is to get certification from MSI as to job and then negotiate with Fretz, Hayes, and Ballard, the Title Eight rental agents, with offices in Town Hall.

The Title Eight units now completed extend up East Drive Hill to some units on Alhambra Circle.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin).

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts in 2 instances, and to include in 1 a statement she made before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and in the other a letter she wrote to the President of the United States and the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. REED of New York.

Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. MACK of Washington).

Mr. PILLION and to include a statement concerning Hungarian Independence Day.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. COOLEY (at the request of Mr. JONES of Missouri).

Mr. DOYLE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WIER and include a newsletter released a few days ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY].

Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. RODINO (at the request of Mr. HOWELL).

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana.

Mr. O'KONSKI in two instances.

Mr. JENKINS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan and to include certain letters.

Mr. BETTS and Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. WOLVERTON.

Mr. MACHROWICZ.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin to insert certain printed matter in remarks made by him in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon.

Mr. UTT and to include an editorial.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. Lecompte, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4557. An act to amend section 319 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to permits for construction of radio stations;

H. R. 4558. An act to amend section 309 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the time within which the Federal Communications Commission must act on protests filed thereunder; and

H. R. 4559. An act to amend section 501 of the Communications Act of 1934, so that any offense punishable thereunder, except a second or subsequent offense, shall constitute a misdemeanor rather than a felony.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Army to receive for instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point 2 citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis 2 citizens and subject of the Kingdom of Belgium.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Lecompte, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on March 12, 1954 present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 5509. An act to amend the Army-Navy Medical Services Corps Act of 1947 relating to the percent of colonels in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 16, 1954, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1356. A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the semiannual Statistical Supplement to the Stockpile Report, pursuant to section 4 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act, Public Law 520, 79th Congress, and in accordance with Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1953, covering the period July 1, 1953, through December 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1357. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to the fiscal year 1954 for the Departments of State, Justice, and Treasury (H. Doc. No. 351); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1358. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1359. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of legislation entitled "A bill to increase the annual compensation of the academic dean of the United States Naval Postgraduate School"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1360. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of January 31, 1954, pursuant to section 5 (e) of the Communications Act as amended July 16, 1952, by Public Law 554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7061. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1347). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7062. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Colum-

bia; with amendment (Rept. No. 1348). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 8377. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. R. 8378. A bill to provide that the Alcoholic Beverage Control Board establish and maintain Government liquor stores in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BENDER:

H. R. 8379. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide that the refusal of a political subdivision of a State to take part in the administration or operation of a State plan for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, or aid to the permanently and totally disabled, shall not disqualify the State for Federal payments if certain conditions are met; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 8380. A bill to provide that certain individuals who are or may become entitled to benefits under title II of the Social Security Act shall be issued a participation certificate setting forth their benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 8381. A bill to amend subsection (b) of section 203 of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide that in certain cases leaf tobacco shall not be considered an agricultural commodity for the purpose of the agricultural exemption for motor carriers under clause (6) of such subsection; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 8382. A bill to continue authority to make funds available for loans and grants under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 8383. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 8384. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Talent division of the Rogue River Basin reclamation project, Oregon; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 8385. A bill to amend section 2382 of the Revised Statutes, in order to make the size of townlots conform in size to local standards; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 8386. A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of the said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 8387. A bill to provide that a greater percentage of loans made by veterans for the purpose of refinancing certain types of indebtedness on their homes will be guaranteed by the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:
H. R. 8388. A bill to continue temporarily existing 90 percent of parity price supports for milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:
H. R. 8389. A bill to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service Academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 8390. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds to provide for the prosecution of projects in the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:
H. R. 8391. A bill to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance under Social Security Act programs through the issuance to such recipients of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:
H. R. 8392. A bill to provide for the extension of social security coverage to the employees of the city of Lake Worth, Fla., effective as of January 1, 1951; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 8393. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 8394. A bill to authorize the coinage of special 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the founding of Groton, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SELDEN:
H. R. 8395. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER:
H. R. 8396. A bill to increase the consumption of United States agricultural commodities in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 8397. A bill to extend the time for initiating a course of education or training under Public Law 550, 82d Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. ABERNETHY:
H. R. 8398. A bill to make the provisions of the act of August 28, 1937, relating to the conservation of water resources in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, applicable to the entire United States, and to increase and revise the limitation on aid available under the provisions of said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. HELLER:
H. R. 8399. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to reduce from 4½ percent to 4 percent the maximum interest rate on home loans made, guaranteed, or insured under that act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:
H. R. 8400. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of postmasters for fixtures and equipment in use at the time of discontinuance of such post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:
H. J. Res. 467. Joint resolution providing for the proper protection of the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GUBSER (by request):
H. J. Res. 468. Joint resolution providing that the Bureau of the Census shall annually conduct a nationwide advisory opinion poll; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:
H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution establishing a Joint Planning Committee for the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:
H. Con. Res. 213. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce relative to health problems; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging congressional action against injurious foreign imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT:
H. R. 8401. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte Meschke Rossiter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:
H. R. 8402. A bill for the relief of the Highway Construction Co. of Ohio, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 8403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Summers (nee Gebauer); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:
H. R. 8404. A bill for the relief of B Amusement Co. (Robert H. J. C. Kenneth, and Mrs. J. R. Bowers) and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:
H. R. 8405. A bill for the relief of Fusa Kimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:
H. R. 8406. A bill for the relief of Juan Jose Aranda Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 8407. A bill for the relief of the Portsmouth Sand & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:
H. R. 8408. A bill for the relief of Ragland Joseph Biggs (also known as Vincent Doig); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:
H. R. 8409. A bill for the relief of Francisco Velasco-Armas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:
H. R. 8410. A bill for the relief of Manuel Garcia Marcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLK:
H. R. 8411. A bill for the relief of the Portsmouth Sand & Gravel Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY (by request):
H. R. 8412. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Del Gatto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:
H. R. 8413. A bill for the relief of Sigrid Brinkhoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:
H. R. 8414. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jack E. Hunt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

557. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Harry Thomas, Jr., pastor, and 26 members of the Church of Christ of New Brighton, Pa., calling attention to the treatment accorded the missionaries of that church in Rome, Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

558. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Racine chapter of the WCTU urging that the Bryson bill to have the advertising of liquor stopped on radio, television, interstate commerce, and also that liquor be taken out of the Armed Forces, be given hearing by the committee just as soon as possible; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

559. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Parkway Council No. 1433, Knights of Columbus, Brooklyn, N. Y., requesting enactment of House Joint Resolution 243 and Senate Joint Resolution 126 with regard to amending the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

560. Also, petition of the secretary, Florida State Townsend Club Council, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate action in the consideration and enactment of the pay-as-you-go Federal social security for all, H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H. R. 6923

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1954

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD, I include the following statement which I made before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce today:

STATEMENT OF HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS OF MASSACHUSETTS BEFORE HOUSE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1954

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before your committee to speak in behalf of my bill, H. R. 6923. The purpose of this proposal is to extend to the

members of the Armed Forces of the United States captured or held as prisoners in the course of the Korean campaign benefits equivalent to those provided prisoners of war and certain civilian internees of World War II.

Last fall, at a hearing conducted before one of the Senate committees, I sat next to one of the boys who had been a prisoner of war and who came from my home community of Lowell, Mass. I was shocked that up to that time no provision had been made for the payment of comparable benefits for the prisoners